

A THEORY-CENTERED MODEL OF DEBATE ASSESSMENT:  
THE RHETORICAL JUDGING PARADIGM

by

KENNETH W. CORBIT SR.

BETH S. BENNETT, COMMITTEE CHAIR  
WILLIAM (SIM) BUTLER  
ALEXA S. CHILCUTT  
ROBERT N. GAINES  
CORI PERDUE

A DISSERTATION

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy  
in the College of Communication &  
Information Science  
in the Graduate School of  
The University of Alabama

TUSCALOOSA, ALABAMA

2017

Copyright Kenneth W. Corbit, Sr. 2017  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

## ABSTRACT

This study investigated collegiate debate and the ways in which it is judged. Debate has long been considered an academic process used to advance argumentation theory and critical thinking skills in its participants. However, over the last half-century, many scholars have determined that, as it is practiced, has become exclusionary to those outside of the debate community and no longer provides educational benefit (Guerin et al., 2005). A review of scholarship on the historical background of argumentation, rhetorical theory and collegiate debate over the last century, provides a foundation for examining extant debate judging paradigms and their impact on participant behavior.

Specifically, the 2014 CEDA National Championship final round was used as a case study to confirm two problems discovered within the review of literature: the impact of shifting judging paradigms on competition and the dominance of gamesmanship. The case study revealed how the judging paradigms have a direct effect on the way competitors prepare for the round. In addition, the case study illustrated how feedback reinforced technical debate, jargon, spreading, and speed. Through synthesis of traditional rhetorical concepts, a new judging model was developed, the rhetorical judging paradigm (RJP), and was discussed as a tool for use in a debate round. Once the model was created, it was used to examine the 2014 CEDA National Championship round. This was done to show how the theory could positively impact the debate community. The primary conclusion of the study is that the RJP be applied more broadly and researched in a quantitative methodology.

## DEDICATION

This adventure began in great joy, and along the way was accompanied by great heartache. In many ways, it reflected my life's journey embracing capacious highs and lows, and there were many times where I felt overwhelmed. Tragedy accompanied laughter, strength corresponding to weakness and peace found in desperation. I was reminded that "I am not a lost cause, I'm just lost." In the middle of losing everything, I somehow found myself again and my true north.

Penny, I dedicate this to you. I recognize your sacrifice, your gift, and your love. Failures and limitations be damned, you are my strength. My hope is that you celebrate this accomplishment with me, knowing that it's as much yours as it is mine. Life offers what it does, but for better or worse I love you more today than yesterday, but not as much as I'll love you tomorrow.

Casey and Chelsea, you make my heart smile! Everything that you are makes me proud. There is joy in your laughter, kindness in your hearts and a purposeful desire to help others. I know you have sacrificed in this journey as well, and for that I apologize and give you my sincerest thanks. If I can ever become half the dad, that I want to be to you both, I will find great satisfaction and peace. Your whole lives mom would whisper in your ear, "You can be anything you want to be. You can accomplish anything you try." She was right! I hope this is an example of what you can do. Always remember, "It's not how you start, it's how you finish!"

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

To reach high usually suggests that you are standing on someone else's shoulders. I would be remiss if I failed to acknowledge those who have elevated me in this journey. Dr. Mott, who is now retired from Eastern Arkansas Community College, you taught me that I could learn. Even though I had failed out of college 3 times and thought that I wasn't capable, your investment made me think differently. While I doubt you'll ever read this, I want you to know that I'll never forget that there is "a rat" in separate and that there will always be flowers for Algernon.

Michael Fisher, you pulled me away from the noise and whispered encouragement in my ear. You told me that I was good enough and that God had a purpose beyond what I could see. Even though it's many years later, and even though I am still learning to believe and walk in it, those conversations have continued to drive me to this end. Thank you.

Chris Harper, words will never express the importance you have played in this journey. You went beyond expectation of friendship and provided opportunity, support, references, relationship, and encouragement. You have always made me believe that I could reach the unreachable. Even though you'd steal the last bite of my Big Mac, you've always had my back. I so appreciate, you my friend!

I want to make sure and express my deep appreciation for my committee chair, Dr. Beth Bennett. I never saw you waver...when I felt like I couldn't do it, you smiled and told me I can. You promoted me for opportunity, encouraged my disbelief, and held my feet to the fire, when I failed. Your investment in my journey can't be resolved with thank you, because it was so much

more, but still, thank you! You continually and convincingly portrayed a joyful spirit of and expertise in research and scholarship. Without you, this dissertation would not have been possible.

Each of my committee members, Dr. Sim Butler, Dr. Alexa Chilcutt, Dr. Robert Gaines and Dr. Cori Purdue have transcended academia and provide mentorship and friendship. Your insights into this study have been of great value and have allowed me the opportunity to express the years of preparation in research format. As importantly, your hands around my shoulder, your letters of reference, and your often “not so subtle” encouragements to finish will never be forgotten. Thank you for your contributions!

## CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	ii
DEDICATION.....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	iv
LIST OF FIGURES.....	ix
CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Overview of the Problem.....	2
Literature Review.....	7
<i>Scholarly Tradition of Rhetoric and Argumentation</i> .....	8
<i>Modern History of Collegiate Debate</i> .....	25
<i>Academic Benefits of Debate</i> .....	32
Theoretical Paradigms for Intercollegiate Debate.....	36
<i>External Paradigms</i> .....	37
a. Stock Issues.....	37
b. Detached Instructive Strategies.....	38
c. Policy Maker.....	38
d. Hypothesis Tester.....	39
<i>Internal Paradigms</i> .....	39
a. Critics of Arguments.....	40
b. Tabula Rosa.....	41
<i>Judging Theory</i> .....	41

Rationale for the Study.....	44
Method.....	46
<i>Rhetorical Lens</i> .....	47
Plan of Study.....	48
CHAPTER 2. CASE STUDY.....	49
The Problem of Judging Paradigms.....	54
Debate Analysis.....	59
<i>Delphic Theoretical Communication</i> .....	60
<i>Spreading and Speed</i> .....	63
<i>Gamesmanship</i> .....	66
<i>The Glass Bead Game</i> as a Rhetorical Lens.....	69
CHAPTER 3. THEORY SYNTHESIS.....	72
Rhetorical Judging Paradigm.....	84
The RJP (RHETORICAL JUDGING PARADIGM) TOOL.....	88
RHETORICAL JUDGING PARADIGM – RUBRIC.....	89
RJP Based REASONS FOR DECISION (RFD).....	90
<i>Use of the Rhetorical Judging Paradigm</i> .....	91
CHAPTER 4. APPLICATION OF THE RHETORICAL JUDGING PARADIGM.....	96
Application of the RJP to the Affirmation Case of Oklahoma.....	98
Application of the RJP to the Negative Case of Towson.....	105
CHAPTER 5. CONCLUSIONS.....	115
Limitations.....	120
Recommendations.....	120
REFERENCES.....	123

APPENDIX A.....	134
APPENDIX B.....	135
APPENDIX C.....	138
APPENDIX D.....	159

## LIST OF FIGURES

1. The RJP (RHETORICAL JUDGING PARADIGM) TOOL.....88

## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

For over two centuries, post-secondary educational institutions have offered training in argumentation and debate, in order to help college students, establish and advance their critical thinking skills (Hunt, 1994). Higher education recognizes the value in cultivating the ability to analyze and assess information. For example, effective training in critical decision making allows students to use logical precepts to make their own independent judgments; specifically, to recognize premises, inferences, and conclusions and to use abstract ideas to assess and test the assumptions of an argument. Such skills are real-world skills, applicable in professional careers and interpersonal relationships alike. Furthermore, students trained in critical thinking and argumentation skills think at deeper levels, and more effectively, than their peers who do not have such training.

Clare D'Souza (2013) has provided empirical evidence that students involved in intercollegiate debate can develop higher skill levels in communication and critical thinking. Based on her findings, D'Souza (2013) concludes that debate competition provides the motivation and the processes to facilitate deeper learning among its participants, while allowing them to practice articulating that knowledge in a public arena. As a result, debate programs and activities have assumed a unique role in academia, providing an opportunity for students to compete against other universities, while enhancing their learning skills in critical decision making, concept application, and public communication (Shaw, 1922).

However, intercollegiate debate has lost its path. While its educational goals are to 1) increase critical thinking, 2) instill effective research techniques, 3) improve communication skills and 4) provide training in applying those skills to real-world problems, debate practice has moved toward an elitist, technical club that places an emphasis on winning over educational outcomes. Debate associations fail to provide competitive events that use paradigms designed to train students in critical thinking. The underlying assumption is that students research topics, analyze and assess those topics, create innovative cases that are then debated with their opponents, thus reaching a deepened level of understanding. However, intercollegiate debate has continued to morph into a technical, jargon driven, format designed at rewarding gamesmanship over education. The result has been student adaption to the game itself, that is, students are using rapid-speak, jargon, vast amounts of evidence, while the quality of argument and critical thinking has been declining (Cirlin, 1997). Gamesmanship and competition have value for intercollegiate debate, but without the reinforcement of educational outcomes, students do not learn to develop the broader skills associated with critical thinking and effective communication. The purpose of this study has been to address this problem and to offer a solution, at least in part, that could reinforce the educational purposes of debate training within the context of intercollegiate debate competition. Let me begin by providing an historical overview of how this problem has developed.

### Overview of the Problem

Despite its potential academic benefits, intercollegiate debate has not delivered fully, and the question we need to ask is why? As early as the late 1950's, when the debate community experienced rapid growth with the participation of record numbers of colleges and universities, many in the academic community recognized that debate had begun to be highly technical in

practice (Swinney, 1968). This technical style of debate, filled with argumentative jargon and delivered at high speed (“rapid speak”), became isolationist for many programs, and argumentation scholars began to question its educational value beyond mere competition (McGee & McGee, 2000). As reported by J. Robert Cox (1974), debate judges initially expressed their disapproval of these tactics in their reasons for decisions (RFD), the written justifications for the outcomes of debate rounds. Eventually, though, debate judges began to accept the tactics as normal to competition and to coach their students in how to employ the tactics to win rounds.

In an effort to rid competitive debate of these behavioral tactics, various debate groups were formed in protest, including the National Debate Tournament (NDT) and Cross-Examination Debate Association (CEDA). Yet, one by one, not long after formation, each group among its own debaters had embraced wholeheartedly the same competitive tactics it had condemned in others. According to Alan Cirlin (1998), by the mid-70s, intercollegiate debate rounds had reached a point where they were no longer accessible to non-debaters, due to the speed and jargon used by the participants. This inability to connect with an audience not trained in debate was viewed as highly problematic. David W. Shepard (1973) reported that former debate judges had begun to criticize the process and refused to let their teams participate in tournament competition. The result was further splitting into debate factions and the formation of new debate associations, yet even the new groups failed to provide effective judging paradigms.

Judging paradigms are important to understand because they become the tool of valuation within the round. Thomas Kuhn (1962) describes a paradigm as a model of thinking. Judges within a debate round provide their own models for valuation and communicate those models to

the participants as the paradigm by which they will be evaluated for the win. Within the debate realm, multiple judging paradigms are acceptable, but each judge embraces his or her own points of emphasis. For example, skills paradigm focuses on eloquence and presentation over theory. Stock issues paradigms use an external paradigm<sup>1</sup> to focus on solvency, harms, inherency, and topicality. The tabula rasa paradigm embraces an internal paradigm<sup>2</sup> that asserts the judge is a blank slate and that whatever rules are applied by the debater will be received, if effectively argued. While there are several other paradigms, these provide clear examples of how the nature of a debate round is framed, based on the judges and their given paradigms.

McGee and McGee (2000) claim that exacerbating the problems created by multiple, changing judging paradigms is the way debate judges typically are selected. Most debate associations choose to let only debate coaches, or prior debaters, judge a round, which increases the impact of judging paradigms on the competitive process. In the late 1970s, increased access to information led to judging paradigm shifts, as judges began pushing technical issues and requiring debaters to use more sources (McGee & McGee, 2000). Cirlin (1997) reports that this change encouraged debaters to adopt a more rapid mode of delivery that enabled them to cite more sources in the round; in quick response, debate rounds began to focus more on the amount of evidence than on the quality of the argument itself. Cirlin (1997) describes the effect as “sophistic” in nature because the value of debate as an argumentative and educational forum devolved into training that focused solely on winning.<sup>3</sup> Experience shows that when judging paradigms are the primary factor determining the behavioral choices made by debaters, pure

---

<sup>1</sup> A paradigm is deemed “external” if it focuses on external criterion to argue the merits of the resolution.

<sup>2</sup> A paradigm is deemed “internal” if it focuses on criterion developed within the round to argue the merits of the resolution.

<sup>3</sup> This reference is to the type of public discourse attributed to the Sophists of ancient Greece. For more explanation, see later discussion (pp. 8-12).

gamesmanship, not critical thinking, is the result. That is, participants seek tactics that will enable them to win the debate rather than to develop the best argument.

The three key drivers supporting this effect are the feedback of judges, the specific judging paradigms applied, and the reasons for decisions (RFD), as stated on the judges' ballots. Motivated by the goal of winning, participants are guided by the feedback of the judges in what they choose to do more often than the goal of making sound arguments. The debate round becomes an arena of gamesmanship that rewards how well the game is played, missing the spirit of that game to educate the participants about how to think critically and to argue soundly.

Today, competitors in most of the active debate associations have learned how to play debate. Common gaming techniques, such as spreading and kritik,<sup>4</sup> are embraced by debate coaches and participants alike in the name of winning. Possessing the skill of being able to talk at 450 words per minute, a skill cultivated for competitive debate, does not mean that what is being said is accurate, persuasive, or even articulate. Yet, as a gaming tactic, using this skill in rounds gets results; debaters who engage in "rapid speak" are able to put so much information on the judge's flow sheet for the round that the opposing debaters cannot possibly answer every line within the time limit. Judges who reward such debaters with a win for using this tactic are not prioritizing the educational goals of debate in their decisions; instead, they are rewarding pure gamesmanship. While not all critical thinking may be lost in the process, the educational goals of holding a genuine clash of ideas, of extending argumentation, and of refining communication skills in practice often are.

---

<sup>4</sup> "Spreading" refers to debaters attempt to place so much information on the judge's flow, and at such a high rate of speed, that opponents fail to answer an argument. "Kritik" refers to a technical and philosophical style of debate. Both tactics are recognized by debate scholars and professors alike as being problematic because they function as tactical ploys, not as sound argument.

For students, debate training and experience should enhance research and critical thinking skills, communication skills, and skill in applying both to their professional careers beyond their college experiences (Shaw, 1922). Certainly, D'Souza (2013) has shown evidence that debaters who attain such skills and are able to apply them often out perform their colleagues. Debate advocates agree that, in practice, intercollegiate debate should have education as its beginning and end goal. Unfortunately, that is not the case in most debate tournaments. As a former National Champion, Team *International Parliamentary Debate Association* (IPDA); Top Speaker in the Nation, Team IPDA; and *Pi Kappa Delta* All-American debater, I have experienced first-hand the pressure to play the game of debate, as opposed to using debate as a forum for learning. While not mutually exclusive, the pressure to win does exceed the educational expectations for growth in knowledge and for the development of good rhetorical skills for effective communication. At the end of tournaments, administrators of colleges regularly ask about win-loss records, opposing schools defeated, and tournament size; they seldom ask about what knowledge the competitors gained that would apply in their lives outside of the tournament arena.

As debate gamesmanship increases, the activity of debate becomes more exclusive, and fewer students are involved. Increasingly, colleges fail to see the necessity of such programs or the value in supporting what is often an expensive co-curricular activity for their students. My purpose in this study has been to interrogate the differences between debate that meets educational goals (academic debate) and debate that focuses on winning (competitive debate) through a case study of actual discourse in the final round of competition for the 2014 CEDA National Championship. Specifically, I have analyzed the shifting judging paradigms that were

used, through a rhetorical lens, to explain how educational benefits for the participants were limited while the rules of debate competition as gamesmanship were reinforced.

At its core, debate is adaptive in nature, meaning it shifts according to the constraints provided. Under Cirlin's (1997) label, the sophistic paradigm, debate adapts to win at all costs. Winning is not necessarily an evil that must be rejected, but a secondary purpose for this study has been to show that a different paradigm, one based on Aristotelian principles to seek truth and to appeal directly to the audience's reason through effective presentational skills, may rightly be preferred to the sophistic one in practice. To this purpose, I have culled traditional scholarship for theoretical precepts in support of a new theoretical paradigm for judging debate. My goal has been to provide a procedural tool for judges that limits their ability to shift judging paradigms and that increases educational outcomes for debaters. The remainder of this chapter proceeds through a review of relevant literature, a discussion of the theoretical paradigms currently in use by debate judges, a discussion of the rhetorical lens and method used for the case study, and a brief outline of the rest of the study.

### Literature Review

To understand argumentation and its rhetorical foundations, as well as debate theory and its current application in intercollegiate arenas, we need to review the relevant scholarship for both. Commonly understood as persuasive discourse and as the study of effective language use (William, 2009), rhetoric has been studied for thousands of years with a desire to explain, to apply, and to master communication principles in relation to discourse in various cultural contexts. According to classical scholar George Kennedy, "Rhetoric in the most general sense, is the energy inherent in emotion and thought, transmitted through a system of signs, including language, to others to influence their decisions or actions" (1991, p. 7). At its core,

intercollegiate debate embraces this general definition, even though intercollegiate debate is primarily the embodiment of conflict at the judging paradigm level. Certainly, for communication scholars, the study of argumentation and debate begins with the art of rhetoric in ancient Greece.

### *Scholarly Tradition of Rhetoric and Argumentation*

From the earliest known philosophical discussions about public speaking, we know that conflict existed,<sup>5</sup> and we have evidence that rhetorical awareness was recognized and understood in Greek culture as early as the times of Homer. However, George Kennedy (1980) claims that the conscious development of rhetoric as an art did not begin until the 5<sup>th</sup> century B.C.E., after the Greeks had uniquely embraced both oral and literary traditions. Havelock (1986) describes rhetoric as a byproduct of the development of literacy. Technically, rhetoric functioned as an art taught to empower practitioners to resolve public conflict,<sup>6</sup> but Greek rhetoricians disagreed about whether argumentative discourse should be taught merely to win or to seek the truth.<sup>7</sup> In practice, the rhetorical art flourished in the 4<sup>th</sup> century democratic city-state of Athens (McCroskey, 2015). As the systematic study of rhetoric developed, so did both its understanding and application.

---

<sup>5</sup> Pre-socratic philosophy, especially that which was influenced by the writings of Heraclitus, displays the significance of paired opposition as a way of knowing. The clash of opposing ideas seems to be fundamental to early Greek thought.

<sup>6</sup> The technical rhetorical tradition, attributed to Corax and Tisias, originated from the practical need to teach people how to defend themselves in court cases.

<sup>7</sup> Sophists such as Protagoras taught their students how to construct opposing arguments (see his *Antilogiae*), that would be persuasive to their hearers. But, Socrates and Plato argued that the aim of human inquiry should be to seek the truth.

Williams (2009) asserts that the earliest recognized teachers of rhetoric were a pair of Sicilians, Corax and Tisias, practicing in southern Italy.<sup>8</sup> Scholars debate whether Corax and Tisias originated the technical form of the art itself or merely accumulated principles from prior teachings in written handbook form. Reportedly, based on observation of actual trials, Corax developed a system that taught students how to win their cases. He took Tisias as his first student and trained him to develop this system further (Kennedy, 1980). Together, they compiled a handbook of technical precepts about public speaking skills and persuasive techniques to train other litigants about how to be successful.

One of the key ideas developed by Corax and Tisias was that of argument by probability. Williams (2009) explains, “in any cause of action, the paramount question was whether it was probable that the accused had committed the wrong” (p. 10). Since the truth of the circumstances was not always apparent, the aim of the litigant was to convince the judge or jury that his position was more probable than the argument or charge against him. Rather than using argument to determine the actual truth in the case, Schiappa (2003) argues, litigants were taught to use precise language to persuade hearers to accept their cases as the probable truth: “It is more likely that Corax and Tisias attempted simply to teach would-be orators how to plead reasonable and hence believable cases” (p. 51). This subtle difference had the potential to shift a decision away from the truth, particularly in the Greek legal system, which used popular juries to determine court outcomes. Many scholars disagree with Schiappa because they believe the rhetorical discipline was already adapting persuasive techniques (Williams, 2009).

---

<sup>8</sup> Williams bases this claim on evidence in Aristotle’s *Art of Rhetoric* (p. 1). Despite the traditional acceptance of this claim for the origins of rhetoric, Cole (1991) and Schiappa (2003) argue against it, maintaining that there is no evidence to support it. Schiappa (2003) further argues that prior to Plato’s introduction of the term “rhetoric” in his dialogue, *Gorgias*, around 385 B.C.E., the term was not in common use. Regardless of its origin, this technical approach to teaching rhetoric is most relevant to this study.

Meanwhile, Greek education during the 5<sup>th</sup> century B.C.E had reached a turning point, often referred to as the Sophistic Movement. For centuries, slaves had been used for instruction within elite families, but itinerant professional teachers began to emerge in the 5<sup>th</sup> century who gathered their students from any who had the ability to pay. Known as *sophistes*, or wisdom practitioners, they focused on practical knowledge and instructed their followers in rhetoric and philosophy, claiming to cultivate *arête* or virtue and excellence in citizens (Williams, 2009). Williams (2009) posits that their access to knowledge from both early Milesian philosophers and from Greek philosophical practices gave them a deeper understanding of how grammar worked and how to use language for influence. Some scholars credit the Sophists with establishing rhetorical theory, but others maintain that the Sophists simply articulated and documented existing practices (Williams, 2009). Although the Sophists maintained that they taught *arête*, their intent seemed much more focused on the practical aspect of winning arguments. As with Corax and Tisias, the rhetorical principles taught by the Sophists were in heavy use in the court systems because they provided tools for litigants to achieve positive results (Wardy 1996). Their critics accused the Sophists of aiming only at generating revenue and achieving victory, not justice, and some, such as Protagoras, became quite wealthy. As Kimball asserts, “The Sophists...attended more to devising persuasive techniques than to finding true arguments, and this amoralism exacerbated the disintegration of the ethical tradition and led to their condemnation” (1986, p. 17). While perhaps an overstatement, the potential for abuse existed, and many contemporaries, especially Socrates and Plato, adopted this critical stance.

A cornerstone to resolving conflict within Sophistic ideology is the idea of being able to make a weak argument appear to be the stronger one. Carol Poster (2005) explains that this tenet was attributed to Protagoras, sometimes recognized as the father of debate for his interest in

argumentation and rhetoric.<sup>9</sup> His study of the use and interplay of words led Protagoras to spend considerable time working through aspects of argument construction and to gain insight into using words correctly or with precise meanings. This knowledge gave him a distinct advantage in Athens in reviewing legal documentation and law. Some scholars maintain that the goal of Protagoras' principle of making the weaker argument the stronger one was to provide support to an argument to strengthen it, thus making it stronger, more persuasive to hearers. Others stipulate that the principle was applied to make the weak argument strong enough to defeat the one that was truly correct (see Schiappa, 2003; Poster, 2005). Depending on which approach was embraced by a speaker, the outcome could be completely different: the goal could be to assist litigants in developing their case more fully, or it could be primarily to assist them in winning the case. Contemporary scholars still take opposing views of the ethical implications of this Sophistic perspective.

Protagoras is also widely recognized as a proponent of radical relativism for his dictum, "man is the measure of all things." Simply stated, this concept recognized the move of Greek thought away from depending on either divine or natural determinations of truth and justice, *dikē* and toward normative systems of morality and social justice established solely by human beings. As Williams (2009) notes, "Although viewing human actions in absolute terms may be fruitful when engaged in philosophy, it has little utility in a court of law, and perhaps not even in the governing assembly, because so often human actions do not involve questions of what is absolutely right or absolutely wrong but rather what is more right and less wrong" (p. 22). Again, scholars have taken varying stances on the impact of relativism, but in litigation, the

---

<sup>9</sup> Bromley Smith (1918) maintains that for over 40 years Protagoras mentored students in Greece in the art of persuasion and argumentation. The timeframe of his life and instruction, 481 - 411 B.C.E. in conjunction with his teaching emphasis place him as a foundational figure for argumentation and one of the earliest sophists.

Greeks moved away from seeking divine truth and embraced the idea of allowing individuals to be the moral compass.

According to Williams (2009), “Relativism and individuality led the Sophists to understand that there are at least two sides to every case, both equally valid from the perspective of their champions even though diametrically opposed; thus, those advocating these positions think that they are obviously right and that their opponents are obviously wrong” (p. 22). From this duality, Protagoras is credited with recognizing and developing two-sided arguments, the *dissoi logoi* (Kennedy, 1980). Protagoras believed that understanding what something is allows an individual to understand what it is not as well. When we can understand what heat is, then we can also understand cold. From this perspective, Protagoras advocated that one should understand and be able to argue both sides and in doing so have the advantage over the opponent (Williams, 2009). Protagoras is also credited with using *orthoepia*, the study of the precise meanings of words and how to apply them correctly in practice (Cole, 1991), which was particularly useful in court cases involving the interpretation of the law or of legal documents.

The combination of instruction in grammar and the *dissoi logoi* argumentative form, the focus on relativism, and the technical training on making weak arguments strong has confirmed for many scholars that the Sophists were more concerned with their own profits than with morality and justice. Poster (2005) argues that this conclusion is further supported by Protagoras’s own discussion of debate using the metaphor of wrestling in his *Practice of Wrangling*. Viewing the court as verbal wrestling, through the lens of competition, promotes the importance of winning rather than of attaining the determination of truth.

A contemporary of Protagoras was the Sicilian ambassador to Athens and a former student of Corax and Tisias, Gorgias of Leontini. Unlike the eastern Sophists, Gorgias chose to

be called a rhetorician and focused on teaching rhetoric to a broader audience. He also stepped away from a focus on teaching virtue and embraced teaching persuasive techniques (Williams, 2009). Because absolute or divine truth was unknowable, Gorgias claimed, belief must be created through the poetic power of discourse. In his own public speaking, he employed poetic devices, later known as Gorgianic figures, which when used at the critical moment, *kairos*, would result in persuasion or, as Gorgias explained it, the deception of the hearers.<sup>10</sup> Gorgias' nihilistic view of truth moved sophistic thought and argumentative practice even further away from concern with seeking knowledge and justice and toward effective persuasion. The growing cultural influence of the Sophists drew the criticism of Socrates and prompted his students, Isocrates and Plato, to establish competing schools (Usher, 1999).

As Athens most influential teacher of rhetoric, Isocrates focused on training future political leaders. He advocated that oratorical expertise resulted from combining natural ability with professional training and practice and only accepted students who had talent deserving of development. He rejected the idea that rhetoric taught absolute truth, but he argued that rhetorical training cultivated practical judgment in his students.<sup>11</sup> Having studied with Gorgias, Isocrates embraced the concept of *kairos* and taught that orators must be able not only to recognize the opportune time to speak, but also to understand the specific needs of the occasion. He trained his students in how to develop appropriate responses by equipping them with both common arguments and stylistic devices as resources and giving them practice in generating

---

<sup>10</sup> *Kairos* is defined as an opportune moment or instance for action. Gorgias believed that truth was only known by the gods, and since man could know it, what men came to believe was actually the result of “deception”, or persuasion, achieved through the power of the spoken word.

<sup>11</sup> Isocrates claimed this practical wisdom, a type of critical thinking, was cultivated in his school, much like the body is trained through gymnastics (see his “Against the Sophists” at [https://archive.org/stream/isocrateswitheng02isocuoft/isocrateswitheng02isocuoft\\_djvu.txt](https://archive.org/stream/isocrateswitheng02isocuoft/isocrateswitheng02isocuoft_djvu.txt)).

specific responses (Sullivan, 1992; Sipiora, 2002). Like Gorgias, Isocrates recognized the importance of stylistic devices in crafting effective discourse, but he did not seem to share Gorgias's view of rhetoric as deception. Nor did he claim to teach *arête*, as the Sophists.

Isocrates claimed to cultivate *arête* in his students indirectly, through the models of effective leadership he selected and the system of education he taught, *paideia*, which focused on Greek culture and promoted a unified Greece. As such, Isocrates expanded the idea of an effective orator to include knowledge and virtue, rooted in Greek culture. Nonetheless, his contemporary, Plato, led numerous verbal attacks against him, claiming that Isocrates was deceitful because his school embraced sophistic principles (Walbank, 2010) and failed to train in logic and philosophical principles (Kennedy, 1991).

Plato, as did his teacher Socrates, regarded the use of public speaking for income as immoral and maintained that persuasion itself was unethical (Havelock, 2005). Plato opposed the sophistic practice of providing training to the masses and firmly rejected the development of handbooks. He argued that increased reliance on written text would lead to a decrease in independent thought and critical inquiry. Plato thought speakers untrained in dialectic would only attempt to win because they could not understand the philosophical aspects of a case. For that reason, he argued, only philosophers should attempt rhetoric (Havelock, 2005).

In his dialogue, the *Gorgias*, Plato states, "Rhetoric is the art of persuading an ignorant multitude about the justice or injustice of a matter, without imparting any real instruction" (Plato, *Gorgias*). To support this position, Plato has Gorgias describe his rhetorical practice as not requiring understanding of the subject matter, concerned with persuasion not with truth, and amoral in application (Plato, *Gorgias*). Plato's critique of Gorgias has traditionally been regarded by communication scholars as harshly anti-rhetorical, though it may more accurately be

viewed as anti-sophistical. Nonetheless, in his later dialogue, the *Phaedrus*, Plato maintains that dialectic should be the basis of a genuine art of rhetoric because it affords a clear method for understanding the subject matter, analyzing the audience effectively, and understanding the available types of speeches and their relationship to the audience. Plato's dialectic used principles of classification and division to understand abstract relationships (Kennedy, 1980). His approach to rhetoric is admittedly exclusionary to those without access to the philosophical or dialectical training he advocated, but he did not think such political power should be generally accessible. His elitist view contrasted sharply with the populist one of the Sophists and provided a unique position for the development of new principles by Aristotle.

Aristotle was a practical philosopher and scientist, and both his disposition toward rhetoric and his school were less formal than Isocrates. Kennedy (1980) asserts that Aristotle recognized the potential for abuse of Sophistic rhetoric but also the impracticality of Plato's artistic criterion for rhetoric and aimed to provide a middle ground, with academic standards for practical application, for his followers. Unlike Isocrates, he advocated that logical reasoning should be the foundation of rhetorical practice, and in the *Art of Rhetoric*, Aristotle offered his own system of reasoning, as an alternative to the Sophist *dissoi logoi* or Plato's dialectical method of classification and division. Aristotle began his treatise by defining rhetoric as an art, a counterpart to dialectic (*Rhetoric I.1.1*). Both arts are methods of inquiry for matters of uncertainty, but rhetoric functions more informally for popular audiences. As Kennedy (1991) explains Aristotle's position, "Rhetoric also allows one to debate both sides of an issue, not to persuade an audience of what is untrue or wicked but to help the speaker understand the real state of the case and be able to refute an opponent" (p. 14). In response to those critical of the

art of rhetoric, Aristotle argued that rhetoric was necessary to society to defend the truth, for without rhetoric, truth would take the weaker position and be defeated (*Rhetoric* I.1.7.).

Aristotle defined rhetoric as “the faculty or ability to perceive the available means of persuasion in any case whatsoever” (Aristotle, *Rhetoric* I.2.1). Within his system of rhetoric, Aristotle incorporated principles from his other writings on logic, ethics, politics, and metaphysics and explained how to develop cases using deductive and inductive reasoning.<sup>12</sup> But while Aristotle gave priority to the development of logical cases, to appeal to reason, his treatise on rhetoric is not limited to argument alone. In this regard, modern scholar James C. McCroskey (2015) suggests that Aristotle seems to have understood that not all audiences are influenced by facts alone, though they still need to be persuaded about the merits of a case. McCroskey (2015) notes that even when addressing a receptive audience, the use of persuasive language and methods, what Aristotle referred to as “artistic proof” (*Rhetoric* 1.2.2-3), is necessary for the establishment of truth. Therefore, Aristotle’s analysis of rhetorical argumentation was built around three means of artistic proof: *ethos*, *pathos*, and *en auto to logo* (within the speech or case itself)

According to Aristotle, *ethos* is the perception of a speaker’s character by the audience (*Rhetoric* 1.2.10). If the audience judges the speaker to be of good character, the speaker has the potential to have greater influence and be more likely to convince the audience of the truth of what he is saying. Aristotle claimed that audiences judge a speaker’s *ethos*, based on three qualities: good sense (sharp mindedness or intelligence), good character, and goodwill (*Rhetoric* 1.2.1).

---

<sup>12</sup> His work, the *Organon*, became the primary text for medieval logic and scholasticism, and his conceptualization of the syllogism was the grounds for formal logic (refer to Aristotle: *The Organon*. 1938).

Aristotle discussed *pathos* as the use of emotional appeals to convince the audience. To recognize the means available to persuade, using *pathos*, the speaker has to know or be able to analyse critically the emotional disposition of the audience. Two audiences might respond very differently to a case based on a narrative or metaphor invoking a fear appeal. Once invoked, though, *pathos* functions as an effective appeal to the audience on multiple levels, which is why so much of the current advertising industry relies upon it to create ad campaigns.

The third type of proof is *en auto to logo*, employing reasoning of the case within the speech itself, either as deductive or inductive argument (Crick, 2013). For Aristotle, sound arguments incorporate probability, verisimilitude, probability and attempt to prove relative truth to the hearers (Kennedy, 1991). For Aristotle, the difference between dialectical and rhetorical reasoning, according to Kennedy (1991), is that rhetorical arguments deal with matters of contingency and are constructed with verisimilitude, to appear true or probable (pg. 14). So, the search for probable truth is fundamental to Aristotle's system of artistic proof.

For Aristotle, rhetoric equips the speaker to construct arguments that assist hearers in their decision making (*Rhetoric* 2.1.2). Based on the kind of decision making required, he posited three species (*eidē* or *genera*) of rhetoric: forensic, deliberative, and epideictic. The objective of each (its *telos*) is determined by the function of the audience, either as judge or spectator, in hearing the arguments of the speaker (*Rhetoric* 1.3.1-2). Forensic rhetoric uses accusation or defence to help hearers judge the truth about past events and render decisions that serve justice. Deliberative rhetoric uses persuasion or dissuasion to help hearers determine potential advantages and disadvantages regarding future actions and render decisions about the most expedient actions for society. Finally, epideictic rhetoric offers praise or condemnation to

those hearers present, on a specific occasion, to affirm shared values and to bestow honor or disgrace upon those who deserve such recognition.

Beyond the contributions of ancient Greeks, several other key figures from the rhetorical tradition, who influenced the study of argumentation and debate, need to be reviewed here. The first is the preeminent rhetorical figure from ancient Rome, whose discourse as well as theoretical work served as the exemplar for rhetorical practice for centuries, Marcus Tullius Cicero. His earliest treatise on rhetoric, *De inventione*, was essentially a compilation of precepts he learned as a Roman school boy, related to speech construction and the invention of supporting arguments and served as a primary text for the study of rhetoric for a millennium.

In the Roman educational system, the study of rhetoric cultivated five abilities or powers in the would-be orator: invention, arrangement, expression, memory, and delivery.<sup>13</sup> In modern eras, these abilities have served as the analytical or generative rhetorical canon for speech criticism, as well as providing a conceptual foundation from which public speaking is still taught today. Cicero was a product of this educational system and earned political prominence in Rome chiefly from his rhetorical skills as a legal advocate. His masterwork, *De oratore*, written at the height of his political career, is a more complete rhetorical treatise that covers Cicero's views on importance of eloquence to the ideal orator.

According to Williams (2009), the system of invention Cicero relates in *De inventione* was derived from the Sophistic practice in *dissoi logoi* and maintained that an argument could be made on either side of a proposition. Cicero offers a system of topics that can be used to discover and to order pertinent lines of reasoning in a given case (Williams, 2009). Cicero embraced Plato's "division and categories" to generate stopping points in a speech or document, allowing

---

<sup>13</sup> The earliest extant treatment of principles for the five rhetorical canon is found in the anonymous *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, often mistakenly attributed to Cicero.

the rhetor the ability to find a middle ground between the opposing views (Griffin, 2006). As Sloane (1989) notes, invention also allows for determining a stopping point.<sup>14</sup> Until this occurs, the audience or judge, has no ability to evaluate the argument. This also allows them the opportunity to discover points of conflict or agreement during the preparation as well and thus provides the ability to construct argument or to avoid a topic altogether (Mendelson, 1997). This led to the second concept in the rhetorical canon, arrangement.

According to Enos (1985), in Cicero's view, arrangement provided the cornerstone for any composition. This process allows the development of presentation from a simple idea to a concrete purpose. As such, Cicero presents a six-part plan of arrangement: introduction, facts, division of ideas, proof or evidence, refutation, optional digression, and conclusion (Cicero, *De inventione*). As with Aristotelian thought, in this instance the rhetor develops logical appeal within the arrangement of the case itself, along with providing ethical and emotional appeals as well. A key aspect of arrangement is that structure and order enhance the persuasive appeal for the hearers.

Expression or eloquence is the third ability in the rhetorical canon and was regarded as perhaps the most important in Roman society. In his mature writings on rhetoric, Cicero maintained that the cultivation of eloquence was unique to the orator and when combined with wisdom enabled the orator, rather than the philosopher, to lead.<sup>15</sup> While arrangement and invention look to the content of what is being said, eloquence focuses on the linguistic manner in

---

<sup>14</sup> From the Hermagorean system of *stasis*, Cicero recognizes that arguments may stop on issues of fact, of definition, of quality, or of procedure (Heath, 1994). This inventional process identifies the main issue at stake and then relies upon common topics or ideas of probability, as well as evidence, to generate plausible reasons in support of the position being advanced by the orator.

<sup>15</sup> Though Cicero's oft-quoted statement on the importance of eloquence appears at the beginning of *De inventione* he develops his theoretical position in support of it in his treatise on the ideal orator. (*see De oratore* I.3.10).

which it is expressed. Contemporary use of the term rhetoric often suggests discourse that is wordy, bombastic, or embellished for merely effect, but for Cicero, genuine eloquence resulted from appropriate word choice meant to clarify or to enhance the message of the speaker (Mendelson, 1997).

In the Roman educational system, training memory or the fourth ability in the rhetorical canon meant generating systems of knowing or remembering, not rote memory skills, that would give the speaker access to knowledge of a subject.<sup>16</sup> Without having the digital means of storing information we have today, speakers needed to be able to bring knowledge into their arguments extemporaneously from their own memories. Often, these memory systems relied upon mental imagery to recall specific details of a subject and enabled the speaker to focus more on the audience (McKeon, 1975).

Delivery is the fifth and final ability in the rhetorical canon. While related to eloquence in that the rhetor is concerned with verbal expression, this ability focuses on how that expression is enacted both verbally and nonverbally (Griffin, 2006). Sometimes delivery is confused with eloquence, but, for Cicero, eloquence was apt expression of ideas. While delivery skills often enhance speaker credibility, a rhetor can be trained in proper principals of arrangement, but skills in delivery are derived from the natural abilities of the speaker. For this reason, rhetoricians, including Aristotle and Isocrates, have argued that delivery skills may be honed, not taught.

The theoretical precepts in Cicero's *De inventione* display a clear connection with the works of Plato, Isocrates, and Aristotle and, in many ways, is cumulative of Greek rhetoric (Williams, 2009). Yet, Cicero is significant for his emphasis on eloquence. The impact of Ciceronian rhetoric in the realm of speech education is definitive and still extends throughout

---

<sup>16</sup> The oldest extant treatment of memory is in the *Rhetorica ad Herennium, Book III*.

many universities (McKeon, 1975). Although later writers, such as Quintilian and Augustine, focused on rhetoric and education, the overall structure remained primarily intact through the European Renaissance, as well as the later epistemological and humanist movements (Honeycutt, 2007). Cicero and Quintilian both argued that morality was key to the speaker, “the good man speaking well” (Quintilian 12.1.1). Aristotle viewed rhetoric as a neutral tool, relative to the ethics of the speaker and his hearers. Honeycutt (2007) distinguishes their positions accordingly: Aristotle defined rhetoric as means to persuasion, while both Cicero and Quintilian viewed rhetoric as a field of study that would help a good man speak well. Augustine, a rhetorician prior to his conversion to Christianity, applied his rhetorical training to adapt Ciceronian precepts to the needs of clerics to prepare their preaching (see *De doctrina Christiana*). His position was that Christian enlightenment or strict study of Scriptures alone was inadequate before congregations of non-believers (English, 1995). The Church needed preachers who were rhetorically adept, not just devout. This Greco-Roman tradition of rhetorical instruction and precepts, both secular and nonsecular, remained primarily intact through the Renaissance and later centuries (Honeycutt, 2007).

During the end of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, according to Sonja Foss (2009), the epistemological age brought the first notable change to rhetoric in more than a millennium. Chief contributors to this change were George Campbell and Richard Whately. Campbell was part of the Scottish enlightenment. He was concerned with rhetoric and eloquence, as Cicero, and felt the aspect of most importance was explaining how eloquence functioned to persuade an audience. So, he focused the process of invention on the psychological disposition of the hearers. This focus embraced the role of the imagination, for the better moving of reason, the will, and the passions in the process of persuasion (Foss et al., 1991). His difference with Cicero was regarding the

rhetorical canon. Campbell focused instead on audience gratification, excitement, and judgment (Foss et al., 1991) Honeycutt (2007) claims that Campbell viewed the Sophist approach of making the weak argument seem strong as unacceptable. As Campbell developed training texts and manuals, his primary focus was on ministers, but it was inclusive of all rhetoricians.

A second major focus for Campbell was moving the focus of the speech to the audience, and making the hearers the primary concern of the rhetor (Foss et al., 1991). Campbell felt that audience members would be invested if the topic posed consequences that would affect them, and seemed urgent (Honeycutt, 2007), so, Campbell embraced the idea of using audience appeals to trigger the involvement of the audience (Foss et al., 1991).

As with most previous rhetoricians, Campbell accepted the idea of logical opposition, but he also introduced probability and plausibility (Foss et al., 1991). In simplistic terms probability resulted from evidence, which in turn led to audience belief. Plausibility was a result of speaker credibility that, as with Cicero, was concerned with style and delivery (Foss et al. 1991). Campbell's position regarding rhetoric was inclusive and original in several regards. His focus was on audience analysis, speaker eloquence, and delivery. While components of Cicero were applied, there is also an inclusion of older sophistic tendencies.

Richard Whately was an English theologian and rhetorician who influenced our modern conceptualization of the argumentative process, as practiced through debate, when he published *Elements of Rhetoric*, in 1828 (see Whately & Ehninger, 2010). As with Campbell, Whately placed emphasis on psychology, yet he differed in that he shifted the focus from the audience to the argumentative process. This shift allowed for the development of what is now considered to be modern debate (Golden et al., 1983). Whately notes that there is an obtainable middle ground between those who consider rhetoric to be only prose and those who limit rhetoric to only

persuasion. Whately allowed that expository speech could function informatively, without narrative or argument construction, and that descriptive speech allowed for description and detail in combination, again without argumentation (Golden, et al., 1983). However, Whately does posit that "it is evident that argument must be, in most cases at least, the basis of persuasion" (Whately & Ehninger, 2010, p. 6).

Whately, as did other epistemologists, combined rhetoric and contemporary aspects of psychology to gain an understanding of behavior, which resulted in an audience-centered analysis of speech development and presentation (Golden et al., 1983). Whately does have his critics, however, because while his focus on argument is distinct, he never clearly defines argument construction (Einhorn, 1981). He discusses the ideas of reasoning and exhortation, and according to Lois Einhorn (1981), the combination of these processes was his intent.

Whately divides the art of rhetoric into four sections; conviction, persuasion, style, and elocution. He maintains that rhetoric begins in its early stage of conviction, as a process whereby an individual conveys truth to the audience through reasoning (Whately & Ehninger, 2010). Whately viewed persuasion as the process of influencing the will. Whately prefers the cultivation of effective expression, style, to elocutionary techniques if one must be chosen over the other. Elocutionary techniques, delivery, according to Whately, are least important; rather the speaker maintain a natural speaking style when presenting a debate or speech (Homar, 2014). Speaking skills are especially important in our assessment of the modern intercollegiate debate presentation skills.<sup>17</sup> Whately is credited for developing the legal perceptions of presumption and

---

<sup>17</sup> See Chapter 2 pgs. 50-52.

burden of proof.<sup>18</sup> Over time, Whately's views have been included in modern rhetoric and argumentation theories on debate (Golden et al., 1983). One can view his fingerprints in most rounds, particularly those that are being judged with external paradigms.

A review of the contributions from the scholarly tradition of rhetoric and argument allows for clear understanding of common thought and areas of disagreement. Throughout its rich history, the art of rhetoric has held conflict over both its purpose and application. From the time of Corax, many scholars have viewed rhetoric as a means to an end. Rhetoric was founded on the concept of teaching litigants how to win legal cases, without regard for determining the truth. Greek scholars worked to transition rhetoric from a mere practice into an art.

Nonetheless, a chasm between eloquence and knowledge still exists in rhetorical practice. This chasm has found its way into contemporary intercollegiate debate, to a point that it has become normalized. Debate programs state that critical thinking is occurring, and point to the utilitarian aspects of case preparation as the place where invention occurs. They maintain that understanding of real-world application is taking place and that students learn how to prepare arguments. Further, as they engage in research, students are given opportunity to arrange their speech in congruent and persuasive fashion.<sup>19</sup> The use of eloquence and delivery are applicable as well, through the use of speaking skills the public. However, debaters follow judging paradigms that reinforce technicalities, without ever training debaters on basic rhetorical understanding. The judging paradigms also negate any necessary rhetorical perspective. To

---

<sup>18</sup> Presumption is defined as assuming something is true or false, which is the logical advantage of the negative team who debate the *status quo*. Burden of proof is usually the responsibility of the affirmative team, which is why they debate first.

<sup>19</sup> This position ignores the fact that some highly competitive debate programs hire graduate students to do the actual research for the teams.

understand the problem fully, let us review the historical foundations of modern intercollegiate debate.

### *Modern History of Intercollegiate Debate*

This section shifts to a review of the modern history of intercollegiate debate, focusing on the development of academic associations of intercollegiate debate over the last century. Jessica Kraft maintains that in its modern form, debate should be a procedure of inquiry combined with advocacy, but that it is failing to do so. She states, “an increasingly diverse group of participants has transformed debate competitions, mounting challenges to traditional form and content by incorporating personal experience, performance, and radical politics” (Kraft, 2017).

The concept for debate as inquiry is that, through the argumentative clash, amicable answers may be found to challenging questions within society. For a debate to take place, there is need of two sides, one in support and one in opposition to an idea. Kraft acknowledges that societal needs for debate were originally identified in ancient Greece. Kraft explains that when a speaker must convince an audience through framed arguments, rather than through scientific arguments, the study of rhetorical discourse can prepare the speaker with the means to advocate for truth (2017). Rhetorical skills can equip people to argue in protection of their own interests as well as to defend positions that are in the best interest of others. However, in debate, predominantly, each presenter argues to convince the audience that his or her side is the only one that is true. Foundationally, it allows a debater to ascertain claims that are deduced from logic and the general system of knowledge.

Since its inception in the early 18<sup>th</sup> century in London, according to Steve Hunt (1994), intercollegiate debate has struggled to maintain an educational basis while avoiding becoming a purely competitive arena driven by gamesmanship. In her historical study, “Popular Culture and

Public Debate: London 1780,” Donna T. Andrews (1996) reports that the early goals of public debate were established by clergyman John Henley and aimed to refine how public presentation and discourse were being practiced. As debates were introduced into the public sphere, as a form of entertainment, they also quickly became a form for monetization for Henley. The transition from purely ideological debate to a public game of oratorical techniques occurred rapidly (Andrews, 1996). Henley resorted to mass media to draw crowds and to entice society elites into the arena. By 1780, more than 35 different debate organizations had been established, involving nearly 1,200 individuals.

The debate societies established rules regarding time limits, topicality, and politeness and established the criterion for choosing judges. However, the failure to offer effective judging criterion has remained a problematic aspect of debate since its inception. The ability to provide an arena for competitive debate without providing a true judging theory leads to a quick disconnect from rhetorical and educational purpose.

Intercollegiate debate associations were developed to create and to formalize competitive intercollegiate opportunities for debaters.<sup>20</sup> These associations have attempted to add hierarchy and to place boundaries on different discussions in debate and argumentation by establishing distinct categories of fact, value, and policy. This organizational structure elevates the importance of argument to assume policy at the top of the hierarchical scheme, so that organizations, such as CEDA, place the highest emphasis on policy debate. During the 20th century, numerous prestigious debate organizations were established, each with its own rules and topic focuses. Most often, they were created in response to perceived negativity within the existing dominant debate association of the time. Disagreements have ranged from

---

<sup>20</sup> Appended at the end of this study is a summary of definitions for these different debate formats.

argumentation theory, presentation and judging paradigms, technicality, and speed. Ultimately, such antagonism has resulted in separation from the existing organization and the simultaneous launch of a new one. In many instances, the demise of the former organization has failed to occur, even with the growth of its replacement. Since many colleges may now compete in different forms of debate and in multiple associations, the would-be debater is left dependent on shifting judging paradigms, rather than upon a universal one that promotes educational outcomes over mere winning.

In 1925, the National Forensics League (NFL) was founded by Bruno Jacob, at the University of Wisconsin (NSDA, 2017). The stated purpose of the NFL was to recognize and to support high school students in debate and speech activities. The first NFL tournament was held at Ripon College, in 1931, and represented 49 schools from 17 states. The NFL continued to expand to include both middle school and college level students. In 2014, the NFL changed its name to the National Speech and Debate Association (NSDA) and is the oldest and largest high school debate association in the world. The NSDA association currently has over 130,000 active members and supports four debate formats: policy debate, Lincoln-Douglas, public forum, and congressional debate. While the NSDA does exist in intercollegiate debate spaces, they are not regularly recognized as a major player, and ultimately there was a need for an association that focused on colleges, which led to the formation of the National Debate Tournament (NDT).

The NDT began in 1947, at The United States Military Academy at West Point, and it remained there for the tournament's first twenty years. At the first tournament, in 1947, twenty-nine colleges were represented (NDT, 2017). Recognizing the opportunity and the need for growth, the NDT leadership divided the country into eight districts, which included multiple states from differing regions. Each one of these eight districts were then allowed to place four

teams in the tournament, with the previous year's winner automatically receiving an invitation to the following tournament.

In 1967, the American Forensic Association (AFA) took control over the NDT. AFA was established, in 1949, to provide an association for speech directors but grew into a debate association that hosted its own tournaments. From their inception, the AFA has placed an emphasis on advocacy and supported policy debate and Lincoln-Douglas debate, making it a natural fit with the NDT. While the NDT and AFA experienced meteoric growth, detractors argued that the focus on speed, while ignoring presentational skills, had negative consequences on participation and on education (CEDA, 2017). The growing criticism ultimately led to the launch of the Cross Examination Debate Association (CEDA).

CEDA, established in 1971, has become the primary debate association promoting policy topic intercollegiate academic debate in the country. CEDA (2017) states that it was established to “serve as a professional association for scholars and teachers in the field of applied argumentation and debate.” However, as academic and professional as CEDA may aim to be, many in the debate community now argue the organization quickly fell into the same shortcomings that led to its departure from the NDT. Incoherent speed, independent judging paradigms, and a heavy emphasis on philosophical arguments, not related to the provided resolutions, were noted as appearing in CEDA tournaments after only a few years of its establishment. Others have argued that new debaters struggle greatly trying to adapt to CEDA debate. According to Rod Dreher, in his candid essay, “How to Speak Gibberish & Win A National Debate Title,” some of the difficulty for novices lies with such tactical strategies as spreading, speed, and gamesmanship (*The American Conservative*, 2014).

The increasingly fierce divide between CEDA and NDT eventually led to the formation of the American Debate Association (ADA), in 1985. The debate coaches who helped found the ADA argued that students who did not receive any official debate training in high school, or at all, still had potential to be great debaters. The focus of ADA was to increase participation in intercollegiate debate, to maintain an equal balance between education and competition, and to ensure a fair, competitive activity for all programs, regardless of their experience or size (ADA, 2017). As a compromise between CEDA and NDT, the ADA uses the debate styles of CEDA, policy debate and a cross examination format, while their topics, format, and time limits are those of the NDT. The goal was not to replace the NDT but rather to correct the excesses of debate and to emphasize more traditional speech elements to provide basic training for beginning debaters. The intent of ADA was to establish interaction and rules of debating nationally. However, due to the inclusion of the same rules as the NDT, complaints of speed, spreading, and poor presentation once again appeared.

The introduction of the American Parliamentary Debate Association (APDA), in 1981, was in response to the failure of ADA to fulfill its goals, as well as to fill the need for a structured parliamentary tournament circuit.<sup>21</sup> At the time, there were three parliamentary circuits in the U.S. A northeast circuit included the New England schools and reached as far south as Swarthmore. About fifteen schools fielded teams on a regular basis, ranging from Harvard to Bronx Community College. A midwestern circuit, bolstered by the University of Chicago, included the major state universities, such as Illinois and Iowa. Finally, a small west coast circuit focused on the smaller schools around Los Angeles. These small circuits were

---

<sup>21</sup> Parliamentary debate is often called “parli” and is a style of intercollegiate debate competition. Parli format has limited correlation to British Parliament government style outside of given speaker titles such as PM (Prime Minister) and OL (Opposition Leader).

poorly structured, and tournaments were announced *ad hoc*, which meant often teams were unable to participate. When the APDA formed, each school involved sent one representative to vote for the association's officers and rules. The APDA wanted to facilitate debate, not shape it, which meant each tournament kept its own quirks and rules. The APDA was simply created to establish parliamentary debate tournaments and not a systematic association. Today, it sponsors over 50 tournaments a year and is an entirely student-run organization (APDA, 2017). The debate style emphasizes argumentation and rhetorical skills, rather than research and detailed factual knowledge.

The National Parliamentary Debate Association (NPDA) was established, in 1991, by Al Johnson, a professor at Colorado College, who felt CEDA, the ADA, and the NDT were not arenas where intelligent students with limited or no experience in debate were able to compete fairly. Since parliamentary debate was not being included in any tournaments in the western part of the United States, there was a great opportunity to start hosting tournaments. Major Gwendolyn Fayne, Director of Forensics at the U. S. Air Force Academy, agreed to allow parliamentary debate at her tournament, which led to the Rocky Mountain Championship and the Western States Parliamentary Debate Association (WSPDA). Shortly thereafter, based on extensive growth and multiple successful tournaments, the NPDA was formed. The NPDA has two hundred and fifty schools attending at least one of their tournaments throughout the course of the year (NPDA, 2017). Unfortunately, the NPDA has not been able to escape the same issues of the organization that came prior to it. In many instances, NPDA has assimilated them to an even greater extent. West coast parliamentary style debate is known to embrace both speed and internal paradigms more than any other association, which has led to the exclusion of new

debaters and a reduction in traditional Aristotelian methods of inquiry, in the eyes of many educators and coaches.

In 1997, two new debate associations were created; the International Public Debate Association (IPDA) and the National Educational Debate Association (NEDA). IPDA was created at St. Mary's University, in San Antonio, Texas. The main purpose was to promote a debate format that privileges public speaking and real word skills in persuasion over the amassing of evidence. They wanted debaters to persuade judges rather than spreading evidence using speed. To support this goal, the IPDA uses lay judges not prior debaters or coaches which, the organization states, assists having an audience-centered debate style. The mission of the IPDA is to provide an opportunity for all individuals to develop their advocacy skills in a forum that promotes respectful and effective communication between debaters (IPDA, 2017).

Similarly, NEDA was founded, in 1997, as a public forum debate. Foundationally, NEDA was intended to increase debater involvement in the methods of communication through audience-centered debate. Participants employ a persuasive speaking style and analytical methods common in public fora such as courts, congress, or classrooms. NEDA attempts to administer tournaments which extend the speech classroom and promote the educational experience. The NEDA maintains that argument should be supported to a general listener with reason over evidence (NEDA, 2017). While both the IPDA and NEDA are relatively new, already they too are having conflict over the use of speed and kritik.<sup>22</sup> Inherently, it would seem, when debate groups form, they are subject to the same traps as the groups they are exiting. As

---

<sup>22</sup> A kritik is the German spelling of critique, and it maintains a philosophical origin. It is used within intercollegiate debate to transition the debate away from the resolution to language, ideology, and existing hierarchies found within the *status quo*. Kritiks argue "real world" implications are more important than resolutions that will never be passed.

such, there is a distinct need to provide a judging paradigm that limits these noted excesses and allows for proper education and feedback to the participants.

### *Academic Benefits of Debate*

Although debate activities provide participants with practice using argumentative principles and drawing logical inferences from supplied data, with such propensity toward abuse, an easy conclusion would be to question the academic benefit of debate, especially in terms of intercollegiate competition. However, there is strong evidence that shows the potential academic benefits of debate to be significant. In 1993, Bill Hill reported that formal contention, in which two opposing sides either support or contradict a stated proposal through a progression of discursive arguments, has been shown to hone stronger classroom skills among those students who participate. D'Souza's research (2013), conducted in urban American colleges, shows that, in general, intercollegiate debaters are approximately 25% more likely to complete their studies efficiently than non-debaters. D'Souza also reports that African-American males who actively take part in debate were 70% more likely to finish their college degree than their peers within college. Participants in debate activities also tend to perform better than their peers on reading and English tests.

Based on a study of the Chicago Urban Debate League, Briana Mezuk and her associates (2011) provide evidence that debate activities considerably improve knowledge in subjects such as English, history, science, art, and foreign language. They argue that these results demonstrate how debate can serve as an effective mode of learning (Mezuk, et al. 2011). Using debate as a teaching tool, instructors can enable students to develop their own critical skills for understanding the contexts for different viewpoints. By increasing student perception, the development of critical thinking increases their engagement in public argument and, ultimately,

motivates them to apply their academic knowledge and skills in real-world situations (Mezuk, et al. 2011).

Mezuk and her associates (2011) also maintain that debate practice may produce indirect effects that influence academic achievement. One indirect effect seems to be that debaters develop mentoring relationships with fellow students and teachers. Previously Mezuk (2009) found peer group attitudes towards teachers and academic expectations of achievement both increase with debate participation, as well as comprehensive scores. These increases allow for better relationships with teachers, which have a positive impact in the overall learning process. This impact is even more favorable statistically with African-Americans, whom are generally seen as needing more supportive success measures (Mezuk et al. 2011). The data suggest that as African-American students become more involved in debate, they are more likely to participate more fully, to have higher expectations of positive academic outcomes, and to view teachers as mentors, not negative authority figures.

Briana Mezuk and Susannah Anderson (2012) performed a broad analysis of 2,179 intercollegiate debaters, in an urban setting, and they used comparative analysis of their findings against randomly selected non-debaters, nationwide, from peer institutions. They found that participation in debate helps decrease the gaps for the students of ethnic minority groups and has an even more positive impact on females than the males. Their ten-year study maintains that debaters developed effective reading and writing practices that subsequently reinforced critical thinking. The addition of these skills allowed for higher scores in standardized testing that focused on language, writing, and problem solving.

While Mezuk and Anderson (2012) do not directly cite her work, their results are consistent with a 1983 study by Jeanne Sternlicht Chall, "Learning to Read." Chall's research

(1983) revealed a distinct correlation between critical literacy and skills in researching, organizing, and communication. Chall (1983) maintains that a key reason for poor academic performance is a student's inability to access or to apply the correct skills. She claims that debate provides the tools for students to learn and to apply research and critical thinking through a competitive communicative process. Her research further shows this experience positively affects the graduation rates, specifically of Latino and Black students, and that African American male debaters had higher academic attainment than their peers (Chall, 1983). The research shows debaters increase reading, writing, and critical thinking skills, deepen relationships with teachers and coaches, and extend belief in obtainable outcomes. When compared with other students in comparative categories, debaters regularly outpace them academically.

Research data on student perception consistently emphasize the value of debate activities for increasing student engagement. Based on their meta-analysis, Elliot and associates (2011) maintain that participation in debate activity increases critical thinking skills by about 44%. Assertive debating activities use contention to dissect and to examine vital issues regarding convictions, government arrangements, and propositions on the most proficient method to enhance the world (Steinfatt, 1990). Elliot (1993) and Darby (2007) show debate is an effective teaching strategy in the classroom and provides an opportunity for students to develop skills such as examining the external environment with their inner thoughts, thus increasing critical thinking. Because debating requires a remarkable array of such abilities, it serves to enhance critical thinking and to allow students to resolve issues, to think fundamentally, and to orchestrate contentions. Additionally, they can present their ideologies in a relevant and persuasive manner. The immediate benefit of such skill is persuading judges to vote for them in their debate round, but it also provides debaters with long term real-world application. These

skills can be used to enter graduate programs, law schools, or even allow them to outperform peers in job interview processes. In general, Colbert and Biggers (1985) conclude:

The literature suggests that debaters benefit in at least three areas. First, forensic competition improves the students' communication skills. Second, forensics provides a unique educational experience because of the way it promotes depth of study, complex analysis and focused critical thinking. Third, forensics offers excellent pre-professional preparation. (p. 237)

The competitive format of intercollegiate debate also provides an effective opportunity for initiating discussion about ethical issues, existing events, or government policies. Increased interest or engagement can prompt increased effort among students in the preparation of arguments and in research for support of their cases. The increase in effort results in better development of abilities. Debate based on counter arguments can also develop the knowledge and skills that aid the debater to become college ready and an elite student. Dolan (1993) has argued that this combination assists in developing a political and civic identity as well. Students develop a sense of empowerment, as well as real-world understanding, which enables them to address domestic and global issues more significantly and to propose effective ways in which the government can solve various social, political, and ethical issues.

To pursue the academic benefits of debate, though, we must recognize that the argumentative techniques of the past have been challenged by major changes in the intellectual landscape of today's learning environments. First, increases in the amount of information available has necessitated an increase in knowing how to find, analyze, and interpret data. The ability to find relevant information has become equal to, if not more important than, the ability to learn the information itself. Next, social change regularly redefines how learning occurs and how to adapt within education arenas, which means adapting to the use of new learning patterns (Shaw, et al. 2007). Adaption of technology in society requires learning patterns that embrace

their implementation, which means debaters must also learn to access and to employ technologies as part of their process of learning to debate. Additionally, interconnectedness enables rapid changes in technology patterns and their dependency on others. The result has led to the development of complex and unwieldy systems and a lack of understanding in how those systems function which holds negative impact for all students. Finally, as discussed by Hill and Leeman (1996), the increased use of mass media has created a type of discourse strongly relying on experts, or selected “talking heads,” to think for society. The millennial generation has pushed this change even further with their heavy reliance on social media. The cultural change in the relationship between the media and the public, combined with the dependence on social media for cognitive and affective reinforcement, has resulted in a new type of group thinking and a distinct lack of critical decision making in general.

In summary, then, although research shows the benefit of involvement in debate and the positive impact associated with the acquired skills, the way debate skills are being cultivated now for intercollegiate debate competition has changed substantially from the way they were acquired in the past. Furthermore, the cultural changes society has undergone in the past few decades challenge what we know about standard educational principles and developing critical literacy. Perhaps, it is time to hold debate judging standards to a new paradigm.

#### Theoretical Paradigms for Intercollegiate Debate

Intercollegiate debate theory can provide us with some critical frameworks or criterion for determining whether the activity functions to cultivate a student’s critical thinking or merely to reward a type of gamesmanship, that is, whether the student is focused on winning rather than on learning. This study challenges existing judging paradigms in their ability to adapt adequately to the aforementioned challenges facing today’s society or as effective indicators of

whether the debate activity focuses on critical thinking. But, before we can address the issue of a new paradigm, we must understand fully the judging paradigms and theory currently in force.

James McBath (1984) explains that effective debate paradigms should ask judges to acknowledge their own judging philosophy regarding debate and to encourage audience members, as well as judges, to listen to the debaters' viewpoints carefully. Mark Hoffman (1989) reports that in requiring judges to state the individual debate paradigm being applied in each round, the competition itself encourages debaters to adjust their style and arguments to fit individual judges. This approach to judging becomes problematic within the debate community, due to its propensity to reward gamesmanship. Debate judging paradigms are expressed through two major paradigms: external and internal.

#### *External Paradigm*

External paradigms focus on comparing the debate round with something that happens in the outside world, which usually includes governmental policies, court cases, or social injustices. The debate round itself is viewed through a lens, similar to a courtroom. The affirmative side in the debate acts analogously with a trial prosecutor. They identify the issues or problems in the *status quo* or the present system on trial. The negative side then acts analogously with the defense attorney and argues against the affirmative's accusation against the *status quo*.

The external paradigm contains several different evaluative criterion. The four common ones in use are explained below.

- a. Stock Issues: The stock issues judging paradigm, or juridical issues that the judges apply to a case, may lack effective voting standards to identify political or academic truth. Under the stock judging paradigm, there is room for critical thought; however, results based on outcomes must focus on truth (Rowland, 1984). Historically debate coaches

emphasize stock paradigm issues because the burden of proof lies with the affirmative side, leaving presumption with the negative side. Because the affirmative has a large burden to form claims through a preponderance of evidence, the result is often an increase in the affirmative's scope.

- b. **Detached Instructive Strategies:** This strategy focuses on debate preparation and topic interest argumentation as an instructional or learning device, and its goal is to determine a disputable point within the resolution (Whitworth, 1989). Often used in intercollegiate debate, research has shown instructive strategies are productive in dynamic learning, (Whitworth, 1989). In this approach, critical thinking skills are used to recognize points of difference, disagreement, or failure. These types of debates, or judging paradigms, must be careful to provide a feedback mechanism to explain the accuracy of the case presented. As D'Souza (2013) notes, such debates can lack the critical skills necessary for effective decision making because their focus is only on winning. As such, judges must focus on giving feedback on the critical comparisons in their feedback.
- c. **Policy Maker:** This paradigm allows the debate to act as a governmental decision maker regarding policies. Participants develop legislation proposals. The case of the affirmative team provides support for harms in the *status quo*, for making legal changes, for using specific funding sources, and for advantages gained through the plan. In response, the negative case posits disadvantages to the proposal, including harms and inherency,<sup>23</sup> as well as offers counter plans to persuade judges to reject the affirmative case. Generally, judges weigh the policies of the existing system against the policies of affirmative case. Jana Bradley and Brett Sutton (1993) argue that the inherency issues conducted by the

---

<sup>23</sup> Inherency is a term used in intercollegiate debate, particularly policy debate, to recognize the systemic barriers preventing the *status quo* from solving the problem.

affirmative policy maker can work to show the existence of harm under the present policies. From the negative side, this paradigm can encourage participants to run vagueness arguments. Vagueness arguments maintain that the opposition is too vague in advocacy, that education is harmed, and an unfair advantage is given to the affirmative position. The negative team can also use a “no policy maker” argument to show that no real policymaker would pass a bill without details regarding such factors as enforcement and funding (D’Souza, 2013). However, this provides a unique opportunity for real-world thinking and application with a debate round. When debaters are forced into policy making roles, they also must contend with economics, cost benefit analysis, ethics, and representation of publics.

- d. **Hypothesis Tester:** This paradigm allows the affirmative side to frame the round through a scientific lens. The debaters and judges test the resolution’s truth through the form of affirmative plans. Plans are tested against all alternative possible hypotheses and strongly focus on judges, which allows for a comparison of ideas, outcomes, and comparative benefits. Renate Mayntz (1993) explains that the negative side provides possible contradictory positions against the resolution, which operate from hypothesis-testing paradigms.

### *Internal Paradigms*

Internal paradigms tend to be judge-centric, whereas external paradigms are considered more debater-centered. In this view, judges feel that verbal confrontation occurs within a debate round without the need for any real-world imitation. Judges tend to permit radical contentions between the resolution and case arguments, and view their responsibility as to assess the relative aptitudes of the debaters rather than determining effective application of their cases (D’Souza, 2013). The

implications of the policy arguments are secondary to the actual argument quality. As such, debaters are able to take more liberty than ever in their case structures, which has led to a significant increase in critical debate cases (Osbourne, 2005).

This paradigm is now becoming the dominant judging paradigm in use on the intercollegiate level. Unfortunately, the internal paradigm may potentially lead to significant increases in radical arguments that are outside the scope of the intent of the resolution. This result stems from the judge's lack of expectation that the case needs to offer any insight into potential real-world solvency. Simply stated, for them, it is a chess match of paradigm and presentation, not an exercise in academic inquiry or in authentic argumentation. Several facets of internal paradigms that need more explanation:

- a. Critics of Arguments: The argument judge paradigm looks to assess the relative abilities of the debaters (Geradin & McCahery, 2005). The implications of the contention provide the basis of the contentions themselves, because debaters build cases based on prior judging paradigms. The result is an expanding quantity of judges who view themselves as critics of contentions. Thus, debaters who would rather focus on the traditional paradigms of argumentation are forced to focus on the argument's mechanics. The contradictions can provide opportunity for evidence to be presented out of context. Per D'Souza (2013), judges are not concerned with correcting poor academic practices; instead, they promote ridiculous arguments and over-claiming evidence. Further, D'Souza (2013) maintains this paradigm includes procedural issues such as topicality,<sup>24</sup> which for the negative team, may take priority over sound understanding of the topic in general. This

---

<sup>24</sup> Topicality is a debate term that allows debaters to frame the scope of the topic. It is employed to determine whether the affirmative team affirms the resolution as worded, thus making it a definitional argument.

paradigm allows judges too much leeway with significance, and they tend to intervene in an argument when presented with opportunity (Banks, 1985).

- b. Tabula Rasa: Paradigmatically, this idea seems to be the cornerstone of many college debate judges. In this scheme, the judges enter the debate without any prejudices. They present with a blank slate of mind, and they focus on the debater's arguments, thus filling the blank slate with their judging paradigms regarding the operational aspects of the debate. The judge allows the debaters to determine the standards to be used in the debate. Geradin and McCahrey (2005) assert that college judges who use tabula rasa view it as a neutral paradigm. For this reason, specific issues within the debates can become significant. Judges listen to the format of debate rules and determine outcomes based on the stated rules which limits the use of effective arguments and discourages the need for effective topic research and critical thinking.

### *Judging Theory*

Since its inception in early 18th century London, academic debate has struggled to maintain its educational basis and to avoid becoming a purely competitively driven activity (Hunt, 1994). According to Andrews (1996), the early paradigms of debate were established by clergyman John Henley in London. Henley was determined to refine how public discourse was being presented (Goring, 2006). Donna T. Andrews (1996) reports that the transition from purely ideological debate to a public oratorical game occurred rapidly, using mass media to draw crowds and to entice society elites into the arena. Competition for paradigms between gamesmanship and judging led to negative outcomes for all participants. The purpose herein is to provide a synthesized theoretical debate judging model to overcome those negative outcomes.

Debate should provide its participants with the principles of basic intuition, combined with presentation and persuasion abilities, and works to train students in developing their explanatory abilities in every aspect of scholastic research. Debaters should be able to think and to convey valuable data rapidly. Mayntz (1993) posits that distribution of data legitimately, effective framing of a narrative, and introduction of alternative perspectives should result in a clear analysis of the resolution and provide the opportunity for judges to have effective comparison prior to their decisions. The examination of debate activity by a judge builds necessary aptitudes used to investigate social issues, governmental policies, norms and values, as well as consequential alternatives, when done correctly. Re-conceptualizing competitive debate, from an outcomes (wins) oriented activity, to an educational one that functions as a strategic tool to cultivate research, argumentation, and communication skills would mean developing an effective paradigm for both presentation and judging.

Theorists usually do not agree on whether the competitive desires of debate should be constrained or encouraged. Whately (1963) was concerned with applications of rhetoric which were focused on both argument and practical use. As noted previously, Whately maintained that rhetoric is an argumentative composition and more than simply persuasive speaking, which is an important point many scholars then, and currently still today, placed singular value on persuasion. As such, argument should be preferred over persuasion. Whately (1963) also focused on concepts such as the burden of proof and presumption as necessary for rhetorical purposes, further establishing the idea of argumentative composition as having components of creating or invention of arguments and arranging them in a persuasive manner. So, while there exist levels

of dispute on the level of competition, it seems practical that any paradigm of judging should include Whately's concepts within their framework.<sup>25</sup>

Management scholars John T. Delaney and Mark A. Huselid (1996) argue that competition is an essential part of college culture; therefore, it is important to understand both competition and instruction. Other theorists, though, see competition as the elimination of cooperation, compromise, and negotiation, which they deem a malicious outcome and which they regard as befuddling academic progress. According to Geradin and McCahery (2005), these critics view competition as something that needs to be replaced with an emphasis on external clarity through education.

With respect to judging paradigms, the outcomes of the debate are regularly determined by the debaters' creation of their own paradigms, which becomes limiting in advancing debate as a field. New students interested in debate are confabulated by the rules. An effective judging paradigm would work to limit the confusion and accessibility. Inoue and Nakano (2004) predict that the decline of debate activity both in popularity and ineffectiveness will be the result of an inability to define its guidance.

Lack of clarity allows to the judging outcomes to be random and inconsistent. A lack of shared norms leaves both judges and competitors frustrated, confused, and feeling disingenuous. As a result, judges essentially place an emphasis on local debate norms and personal intuition to provide results (Inoue & Nakano, 2004). Furthermore, debate competition tends to be more unfair when based on unspecified and uncodified knowledge. Debaters without experienced peers or expert coaching regarding these norms are at an inevitable disadvantage. The unavailability of identifiable documentation and paradigms to explain principles and rules from

---

<sup>25</sup> In Chapter 3, I set out what I am proposing is an improved, effective judging paradigm for intercollegiate debate.

which their speeches should follow and be judged has reached a detrimental level. The lack of a normative judging paradigm affects performance significantly and tends to alter debate competition, due in part, to debaters altering cases based on individual judging paradigms. These factors also affect counter argument options for the negative side that relies upon systems, policies, and access to them for effective presentation of the data. Thus, Padbury and Zhang (2011) conclude that the way debaters prepare for competition is more focused on judging paradigm than on effective research and argumentation.

Debate competition should enable debaters to work with synchronistical coordination and should have a strong emphasis on research. It should encourage understanding of topics, conceptualization of data, and concise discussion. Debaters should be distinguished fundamentally by their use of data, including organization, relevance, applications and comparison (Gilbert, 2006). In addition, debates should build the capacity for individual inference and advance thinking in relational abilities (Geradin & McCahery, 2005). This skill development gives debaters a vehicle to express their conclusions confidently, in a deferential way, on a significant issue or theme. In this way, debate is an effective approach to building transversal abilities in university students (Rathmann, Szklo, Schaeffer, 2010).

#### Rationale for the Study

Intercollegiate debate is effective for examining issues of importance, in an atmosphere of discourse and reasoned argument (Rathmann et al., 2010). However, intercollegiate debate competition has several issues threatening its relevance in and benefit to today's society. Perhaps the most significant is the lack of theory-centered judging criterion. Within this study, I use a critical perspective to develop a preliminary theoretical frame for judging intercollegiate debate. To address existing issues within intercollegiate debate competition and to demonstrate

the importance of a universal judging theory, to maintain an effective academic forum, students should be taught to question the resolution given within the round. This questioning is key in developing effective critical decision makers. Freedom to focus on resolution analysis and case development allows for a reflection on societal values and expectations (Rathmann et al., 2010).

Established rules regarding time, topic, and forum, inclusive of sound judging philosophy are a precursor to an effective outcome. Currently, existing intercollegiate debate paradigms fail to address or express the necessity of effective argumentation, thought, and ethics of debates; rather, the emphasis lies in viewing debate as merely a competition (Geradin & McCahery, 2005). A negative impact for intercollegiate debaters can significantly decrease the thinking process of society at large, which in turn causes an increase in the ethical concerns within society. Intercollegiate debate competition should not focus on local paradigmatic cultures, but instead on accuracy and application of effective research. The failure to offer effective judging criterion has been a problematic aspect of debate since its inception. The ability to provide an arena for competitive debate, without providing a true judging theory, has led to a quick disconnect from its intended purpose. Instead of providing grounds for sound educational practice, critical thinking skills, and persuasive oratory skill, participants are learning to focus on the rules of specific debate associations and then manipulating those rules to win, instead of advancing sound arguments. If intercollegiate debate continues to allow its activities to aim solely toward this end, neither education nor effective judgment will be the result for its participants.

As noted above, there is a gap in the goal of academic debate and that of the competitive landscape. Debaters tend toward the competitive arena because coaches are focused on winning tournaments. In many instances, the judges in debate rounds are coaches and former debaters

who implement individualized paradigms. Since debaters are pushed toward winning, they embrace the competitive paradigms, which may reduce the educational outcomes. Due in part to the adaptive nature of competitive debate, instead of seeking an Aristotelian outcome of truth for their inquiry, debaters become Sophists in pursuit only of winning. This goal is reinforced by judging paradigms that often lack educational perspective.<sup>26</sup> The lack of a universal educational criterion leads to negative behavior such as spreading, speed, and kritik not associated with topical resolution. When debaters enter a round they are forced to adapt to an individualized paradigm, which shifts from round to round, to garner the win. The need for an educational paradigm does not exclude a competitive format, but must be given more priority. The purpose for developing a rhetorical judging paradigm is to provide that priority.

### Method

To develop a rhetorical judging paradigm for intercollegiate debate, this study used a method of problem/solution critical analysis. To accomplish this, I utilized a case study of the 2014 CEDA National Championship round, wherein I identified the problems with extant debate judging paradigms. Hesse's *The Glass Bead Game* is a rhetorical lens for showing key perspectives on gamesmanship. My analysis shows how debaters use debate theory to "win" a round, often at the expense of education. The basic purpose of debate competition, to enhance the education and the intellectual skills of students, is not being achieved if the singular goal is only victory in a debate round. I show how the problem is reinforced through the extant judging paradigms. I offer as a solution a synthesized "judgment-centered" theory for competitive debate

---

<sup>26</sup> The outcome of this approach is illustrated by the case study in Chapter 2.

that rewards rhetorical (persuasive) and critical thinking (prudence) skills associated with academic debate in education.

### *Rhetorical Lens*

*The Glass Bead Game* (1943) is a fictional novel written by Hermann Hesse, an anthropologist with a keen insight of culture. The novel reflects the knowledge of the created world in the way it is written. *The Glass Beads Game* uses the life of Josef Knecht, game master of glass beads. Hesse recounts Knecht's life, from his childhood to his death, as someone writing a biography. Although a completely fictional character, Hesse worked diligently to report the experience of Knecht and his deeds. Knecht was part of an elitist intellectual society that had one goal, the mastery of the Glass Bead Game. As a child, Knecht played the game in his mind to pass time. It provided mental stimulation and intellectual engagement.

In short, the game provided a way to synthesize mental values. The text provides insight into the minds of elite intellectuals and delves distinctly into the perfection of the form. Within the story, Knecht is confronted with the arrogance that is represented by self-indulgence of the game. A key aspect of the text is the focus on mastery of the game, and on mastery of spiritual and mental values being synthesized. Ultimately, and posthumously, Knecht is used as a type of sacrifice. The revelation is that the Castilians, as well as Knecht, spent so much energy on perfecting the game that they forgot that the intent was application of spiritual values.

*The Glass Bead Game* provides an effective rhetorical lens for critical rhetorical analysis within intercollegiate debate. While debate has the intent and purpose to educate the student, the student uses the information for gamesmanship. Gamesmanship is the use of questionable techniques to win or to pick up a genuinely favorable position in amusement or game, and it signifies the need to win over the objectives of the game itself. Potter (1947) defines

gamesmanship as “describing the guidelines as much as possible without getting discovered, utilizing almost any questionable techniques conceivable to accomplish the coveted end” (Potter, 1947). In the end, the emphasis is on the game and not on the acquisition of or application of knowledge.

### Plan of Study

The remainder of the study is presented in four chapters. The next chapter, Chapter 2: Case Study, provides a content analysis of the discourse and judging in the 2014 CEDA National Championship round. It investigates the existing judging paradigms and illustrates the negative outcomes of those models. Chapter 3 provides a discussion of proposed theoretical principles which could replace existing judging paradigms and which could be synthesized to develop a new judging paradigm for intercollegiate debate. This chapter defines the need for a new judging paradigm with clarity. Chapter 4 explains the new judging paradigm, with simple criterion, applied to the case study and discourse to illustrate it in practice. Chapter 5 provides the benefits to be gained from the new theory, in both the competitive and academic communities, as well as directions for future research and implementation.

## CHAPTER 2

### CASE STUDY

Uh, man's sole jabringing object disfigure religion trauma and nubs, uh, the, inside the trauma of representation that turns into the black child devouring and identifying with the stories and into the white culture brought up, uh, de de de de de, dink, and add subjectively like a white man, the black man!

When the nigga, uh, sees these pains and suffering that he can only, uh, envision himself that he, uh, does not see another nigga that he, uh, can feel sympathy for or embrace, but rather, uh, that, a-bluh, that that otherness gets obliterated.

Uh, says that the the the way status co works is through, uh, whiteness allowing, uh, forcing other bodies to tell, uh, nearations of whiteness in, uh, the violences that whiteness does me, uh, say that that is the link that we will go for!

She ain't got time from beat'n my ass, but ya'll I be hav'n dreams of chocolate covered watermelons. Yah yah yah.

Aunt Jemima and Uncle Ben be hid'n in the corner and shoot'n kids.<sup>27</sup>

While easily construed as possible rap lyrics or slam poetry, this text is difficult to recognize as a debate case, much less one presented in the final round of a national championship, yet it is. Furthermore, the intermingling of these phrases was forced through short-breathed participants at a dizzying, often unintelligible rate.<sup>28</sup> The participants from the Universities of Oklahoma and Towson University bombarded the judges for over two and half hours with such content, after which the judges chose a champion, much to the chagrin of many within the debate community and the larger world of argumentation and persuasion.

---

<sup>27</sup> Quoted from the actual transcript of the 2014 national championship round for CEDA. This text and subsequent textual references were secured from the final round video on *YouTube*. For reference purposes herein, the text is appended to this study.

<sup>28</sup> A video recording of the round is available at [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YqcX\\_tpQu3U](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YqcX_tpQu3U).

The 2014 competition was held at Indiana University, and the contestants were Rashid Campbell and George Lee, from the University of Oklahoma, and Ameena Ruffin and Korey Johnson, from Towson University. The two teams were debating this resolution:

**RESOLVED:** The United States Federal Government should substantially increase statutory and/or judicial restrictions on the war powers authority of the President of the United States in one or more of the following areas: targeted killing; indefinite detention; offensive cyber operations; or introducing United States Armed Forces into hostilities.

The Towson University team of Ruffin and Johnson won the round and became the first African-American female team to win the national CEDA tournament. On the surface, this event would appear to be an opportunity to celebrate inclusion and diversity and to recognize the limitations of gender and racial stereotyping; however, within the academic community, it caused an explosion of critical commentary, due to the content of the round.<sup>29</sup> The criticism was not limited to Ruffin and Johnson, nor did it fail to include Campbell and Lee, but it centered on the failing of the debaters to address the resolution, the lack of academic value, the speed of the round, and the overall lack of rhetorical value within debate (Dreher, 2014). Multiple scholars and news sources openly remarked about the round. They focused their comments on the incoherence of the presentations, especially the bumbling performative manner of the debaters. Critics bemoaned the lack of educational value of the debate and maintained the round was filled with foolish jargon, designed to use perceived racial inequalities, as a way to sway judges.

Perhaps even more significantly, the controversial round called into high criticism the use of race to win a round and the impact of race in intercollegiate debate (Kraft, 2014, & Anglin, 2014). Some critics even went so far as to state that the win was a response to white privilege and that Towson University was awarded the win as recompense (see APPENDIX B). The outcome did not auger well with many in the debate community who thought these minority

---

<sup>29</sup> For examples of this criticism, see Anglin (2014) & Dreher (2014).

students were disrespecting the rules of debate.<sup>30</sup> In his *Elements of Rhetoric*, Whately emphasizes that respecting the rules of every argument is paramount (Whately & Ehninger, 2010). In addition, the final judging decision 7-4 (see APPENDIX A) left the impression that the majority of the judges failed to use a paradigm that valued rhetorical skill or effective argumentation.

Incensed at what they perceived as a violation of basic argumentation, rhetorical response, and communicative processes, critics began to share a video of the round on *YouTube* and other platforms, along with negative remarks, inviting others to comment. The backlash was so strong that every video of the round was pulled off the Internet and threats of content violation were pressed. According to Dreher, people commenting on the video claimed this debate performance was destructive to the debate community because it rewarded poor scholarship and embraced form over content (2014). As criticism increased, it prompted a defensive response from those in the debate community who embrace purely “tabula rasa” debate paradigms.<sup>31</sup> These proponents maintained that the opportunity for debaters to create their own paradigm, was quintessential to the debate process. The gap between their internal paradigms, and those supporting external paradigms, was massive. Simply stated, the community that supports an internal paradigm, centric to the round itself and a heavy emphasis on the debate game, directly opposed those with an external paradigm, who believe debaters should deal with real world issues. This is a clear delineation of both style and model, and the 2014 CEDA final round drew the preverbal line in the sand.

---

<sup>30</sup> See for example Anglin (2014) and Dreher (2014).

<sup>31</sup> The tabula rasa debate paradigm is defined in Ch. 1, pg. 40.

The turmoil reached a point of explosion, and the President of CEDA, Paul Mabrey, was forced to issue a statement to quell the situation:

We will never have the time or other resources to respond to each and every attack made against members of our community. And nor should we respond to every act of offensive racism. We must not aid in circulating their ignorance, bigotry and violence. However, we must not let their stories continue without our perspective and our voice. We must flood media, social networks and other spheres of influence with our overwhelming messages of support. (APPENDIX B)

Mabrey's response failed to deal with the academic and theoretical issues that had been raised and instead seemed to suggest that those who opposed the results of the tournament were both bigoted and racist. Subsequently, all videos of the round and judge's ballots were removed from all online venues. The culmination of missteps in the handling of this situation provides a unique opportunity for a case study. As such, the 2014 CEDA National Championship provides an opportunity to review existing debate judging models and to offer new paradigms.<sup>32</sup>

As noted in Chapter 1, since its inception in 1971, CEDA has been recognized as the major intercollegiate debate association promoting policy topic style debate. Currently, CEDA is the largest debate association in the United States. It endorses more than 60 tournaments every year and holds an annual National Championship Tournament that gathers 175 different debate teams from around the country (CEDA, 2017). While the purpose of the tournament is to determine the national championship, it is in fact the culmination of a paradigm and method viewed as the capstone for debate success within policy debate. As the model to which all teams aim to aspire, it would seem reasonable to examine the final round as representative of the highest achievement of this model, while also providing a glimpse of the types of conflict within the intercollegiate debate circuit. According to Dreher, many members of the intercollegiate

---

<sup>32</sup> While acknowledging that the controversy over the 2014 CEDA national final also reveals the severe conflict regarding racial issues that exists within intercollegiate debate, for this case study, my focus is on the problem of judging paradigms.

debate community see the national finals as the culmination of independent thought, philosophical application, and persuasive skill, while others see the competition as an exclusionary arena that embraces negative aspects of spreading, speed, and gamesmanship (2014). Significantly, these problems have been present in every final debate round, viewed independently, over the last ten years.

Peter Swanborn (2010) advocates using a case study to examine specific populations. Brent Flyvbjerg (2006) maintains that case studies are the proper methodology to understand specific narratives and characteristics of a research problem and suggests that its general theoretical design allows for a practical understanding of the problem area. Case studies are more than a verification of bias, or a development of the most general theories and ideas, but are in fact effective in hypothesis verification and provide clarification (Flyvbjerg, 2006). An effective case study can provide recognition of a problem, allow for deeper understanding of the problem, offer discussion on the issue, and provide recommendation for a solution (Seawright & Gerring, 2008). To be effective a case study must focus on an area of research that needs deeper analysis, provide insight into the problem, look to recognize current prevailing thought, seek to provide a specific resolution to the problem, and post examination offer a solution and further research (Seawright & Gerring, 2008).

Herein, this method has been employed to look at how judging paradigms are used to reinforce specific behaviours within the CEDA college debate arena and to extrapolate trends, results, and thematic behaviours used by the participants. A case study of the 2014 CEDA national finals also permits comparison of the findings with the larger CEDA debate community (Swanborn, 2010). As discussed in Chapter 1, intercollegiate debate provides a unique opportunity for critical learning within its participant population. Further, this case study

provides insight into problem areas specific to the reinforcement of gamesmanship over education through existing judging paradigms forced upon the participants.

### The Problem of Judging Paradigms

While CEDA provides a general overview of debate expectations and goals, the ultimate decisions for the rounds are determined by the judges within the round. As the CEDA bylaws state:

Judge practices are important to the debate activity. In addition to supplying decisions as judges, they educate the student participants through their reasons for decision and suggestions for improvement. CEDA recognizes the inherent tension and potential conflict between these two roles. In an attempt to facilitate both functions, CEDA encourages judge-educators to acknowledge their two-fold responsibility and act with competence, integrity, fairness and courtesy before, during and after each debate round. Debate seeks to be a full, free testing of ideas. Yet as educators, some feel a responsibility to discourage student behavior they find to be counterproductive. Often judges must delicately balance these two considerations: the need for rigorous examination of any and all views, however unpopular or unrealistic and the guidance and direction of student behavior. If undesirable behavior is discouraged in a positive, fair and courteous manner, the judge/educator roles can be simultaneously satisfied. (CEDA, 2017)

As a result, judging paradigms establish the way intercollegiate debate rounds are performed by the participants quite simply because the paradigm is the explicit format the judge reports will be used to decide who wins the round.

Prior to the 2014 CEDA National Tournament, each judge submitted a judging paradigm, in which each expressed his or her own preference for internal or external paradigms, specific presentational styles, the use of kritik, as well as additional individual debate philosophies. These judging paradigms were made available to the contestants through an online portal and judging paradigm book. However, the judges maintained the prerogative to update these paradigms throughout the progress of the tournament, which established somewhat of a moving target for those participating in the competition.

In identifying conflicting goals, between teaching education and judging, CEDA encourages its judges to accept “any and all views,” regardless of how “unrealistic.” Nevertheless, this policy focuses more on the win than on the educational process and leads debaters directly into gamesmanship. Thus, for participants, the judging paradigms become the foundation for their performance -- the successful debater must be more concerned with the individual judging paradigm than with the specified goals of CEDA.

Gamesmanship, which forces the debater into a win/lose mentality, usurps the educational goals of debate and is reinforced through multiple judging paradigms. My own experience as a former debater, and now as an educator, has been consistent with this position, and I maintain that forced gamesmanship not only leads to negative educational outcomes, but also advances an intrinsic division between real-world critical thinking and debate-world philosophies derived for the sake of competition. This gulf limits access to intelligent minds because they are eliminated from argumentation opportunities based on shifting rules that they cannot comprehend. For example, having more than 100 competing paradigms, at the beginning of the tournament, which are then updated or shifted during the tournament, forces competitors to hold all of those paradigms in their minds while operating through one debate lens.

Additionally, the differing paradigms lead to confusion and frustration on the part of debaters. Debate advocates argue that this forced adjustment creates intellectual flexibility in the debaters and helps develop real-world adaption skills. However, when viewed specifically, it works to create a mindset of adjustment based solely on the win. When there is a failure to provide a specific model for debaters, they are given free rein to create their own, which is the foundation of gamesmanship. We can see the results in examining what the competitors chose to do in the final round.

Let us begin by reviewing the judging paradigms of the eleven judges for the round, which were offered to participants within the round (refer to APPENDIX C). We can see that they provide a multi-policy of confusing and competing values. Judge Ben Allen advised, “Debate is what you make it, so first and foremost ALWAYS DO YOU!!!!” Deven Cooper reported, “The best speakers I expect to see this year have a high grade of Charisma, Uniqueness, Nerve, Talent, and Swag.” Yet Christopher Vincent maintained, “All ethics challenges will be decided through the infamous RuPaul Paradigm: The Time Has Come for you to Lip Sync for your life.” When competition occurs, debaters are urged to choose which to follow, thus they enter an arena where their first thoughts focus on how to win, rather than how to communicate effectively and seek the truth.

Debaters are encouraged to an individual level of thought, and truth construction, prior to being guided through round by the provided judging paradigm. The comments make it clear that the initial focus of the judge is that of performance within the scope of the game. Thus, the debater is influenced to behave as a player within a game, not as a scholar within a rhetorical arena. Beyond that, the debaters are left attempting to guess at what the judge is even saying. The advisement, “Do you, with swag, through a RuPaul paradigm” sounds like a conglomeration of memes more than the debate models of judges from three major universities. These not so subtle tags are simply encouragers of gamesmanship, as Ben Allen expressed the following:

I hate most theory args (unless its super creative), I hate high theory, by high theory I mean all those white dudes who were clearly high when they were writing their shit, If you read that stuff make it as real-world as possible! I hate debaters who just read into a computer screen and never look at the judge, stuff like that causes you to lose speaker points.

Based on this judging feedback, we would conclude that Allen hates theory arguments but will accept them if they are creative. The debater must therefore choose philosophies that are

not known to the judges or other debaters and express them with speed and overwhelming amounts of evidence. Additionally, although the debater is advised to “look at the judge,” so as not to lose speaker points, there is no emphasis placed on authentic audience-centered presentation or persuasive skills; merely making eye contact suffices as acceptable.

Neither is there a statement of coaching or of instructional feedback that would advance the education of the debater. Rather, there is a set punishment if they do not play the debate game. Consider Blake Hallinan’s judging paradigm:

[W]hat my role as a judge is. I prefer this to be made explicit in the debate round. If both teams are in agreement, I will default to the implied role and meaning. If both teams are in disagreement, I will default to the framework established through debate. If both teams are in disagreement and do not debate the framing for the round, I will be very sad.

Hallinan has announced that there is no paradigm being offered; nonetheless, the judge expects the debaters to provide one, and if they fail to do so the judge, “will be very sad.” As Beth Mendenhall states, “Debate about debate: yes - it's good for our community and its good for you. BUT - I'd like some guidance from the debaters.” These are examples of internal paradigms which look to the debater to establish guidelines and where judges are not concerned with either theoretical or real-world applications or outcomes (Geradin & McCahery, 2005).

When debaters are required to develop their own paradigms, they are allowed to play the game of debate, leading them often away from developing real-world skills that are assumed to be at the core of intercollegiate debate. Without instructive feedback, they never learn about Whately’s argument theory or effective Ciceronian rhetorical principles or even how to develop better arguments or to enhance their presentational skills. Rather, they are focused on not making the judge “sad” to obtain the win. Furthermore, this reinforcement of the internal paradigm model creates an environment of debating about debate, which often excludes debating the resolution. If there is a need to debate about the aspects of debate, it should be done outside

of the debate round so that scholarly education may occur. This type of paradigm requires debaters to be looking at judging models as they would rule in a sport. The acceptance of rule change, by the participants, during an event would never be accepted in any other competitive forum. Neither would participants within a sport be allowed to suggest, create, or implement new rules during the middle of a venue. Yet, it is embraced, often required of intercollegiate debaters. This norm demonstrates that intercollegiate debate judging does not aim at reinforcement of educational or academic principles, but rather on how to play a game in order to win it.

Internal paradigms become uniquely conflictive for debaters, mainly due to the inclusion of external paradigms, which occurs between judging paradigms and often even within the same judge's preferences. Christopher Kozak begins with an external paradigm: "My judging philosophy/preference is simple. Make arguments. That includes a claim, a warrant and why in a world of competing claims does your claim matter." Kozak continues with the following internal paradigm:

I like original thinking in debate and will try my best to adapt to any performance style that you wish present in the round. Just be aware to all teams when debating framework on these issues that I do not consider appeals to "objective rules" persuasive in the context of determining debate norms. Debate is a rare activity in which students are allowed to define the conditions of their own education.

The conflict between internal and external criterion often fails to provide accurate direction or focus for the debater.

In analysing Kozak's directions above, the debater is told to use an external model and to "make arguments that include a claim, a warrant," and at the same time, the debater is told to "define the conditions of their own education." This type of confusion tends to limit the number of debaters who choose to enter debate. Even for those who do participate in intercollegiate debate, understanding the rules of debate creates intellectual grounds that are permeated with

conflict. Debaters must create the rules, with the purpose of winning, at the cost of theoretical influence, and are told they are defining “their own education”.

From this actual competitive round, it is easy to recognize how the debaters were being directed to be active in their own gamesmanship and how to play to win. There is more at play than just a confabulation between an internal and external model. Judging paradigms influence debaters as they prepare and perform in the competitive arena. These paradigms allow, encourage, and cause students to embrace the debate-world at the expense of expecting any common academic benefits of the activity, benefits which could have real-world application. My position is that judging paradigmatic influence exceeds this particular championship round and includes the last 100 years of differing opinion. If we recognize the negative aspects of a lack of central judging paradigm, then we may also recognize the need to provide such a model. A fuller analysis of debater performances and thematic applications within the round follows.

### Debate Analysis

As noted above, judging paradigms both foster and promote specific outcomes within a debate round. The problem areas result in Delphic theoretical communication,<sup>33</sup> spreading and speed, and a usurping of gamesmanship over academic and real-world application. Each of these factors is limiting and confusing and as such cause tumultuous outcomes. Better understanding and reflection on the existing paradigms, show the need for alternative models. Further analysis of the 2014 CEDA final round reveals show how the exhibitions within are a result and reinforcement of negative judging paradigms.

### *Delphic Theoretical Communication*

---

<sup>33</sup> Delphic Communication – In ancient Delphi oracles were consulted regarding decisions and the future. They were often aloof; thus, the phrase Delphic communication means obscure in meaning and ambiguous; without clear intent or focus. For further explanation see <https://www.collinsdictionary.com/us/dictionary/english/delphic>.

If intercollegiate debate has educational goals for participants, then among them should be learning how to convey ideas clearly. Debate's should strive for clear articulation of ideas that are presented in a format that gives easy access to judges, and audience members alike. However, competitors often debate in a fashion that is intentionally ambiguous and inaccessible to gain the advantage in the round. The ambiguity of the case, along with intentional inaccessibility, means that the opponent cannot be certain of the actual argument. This goal is achieved by reading extensive evidence, at high rates of speed, and speaking as though the speaker had expertise. According to McGee, this strategy is rewarded and encouraged by the judges, and it has historically been problematic in intercollegiate debate (1993). When colleges become part of a debate association, they adapt to the judging paradigms already implemented. As such, those programs entering the organization further indoctrinate those models (McGee & McGee, 2000). CEDA began as a rejection of NDT. Once their paradigms were established, new colleges looking to join had to adapt to them.

Delphic theoretical communication is reinforced through judging paradigms. When debaters are forced to increase the amount of evidence within a round, their competency decreases (McGee, 1993). Judges expect the debaters to provide extensive evidence within the limited timeframes. Debaters then adapt to reading, not understanding, explaining, or learning first. Judges make the mistake of believing more evidence leads to more clash or better argumentation (McGee & McGee, 2000). As a result, debaters spew jargon, manifest audience-abusive delivery tactics, and fail to own or to explain effectively the substance of what they are arguing. The CEDA 2014 final round is exemplary of this problem in intercollegiate debate.

Despite the questionable application to the actual resolution, within the CEDA final round, queer theory was a major component. Yet, demonstration of understanding of queer

theory or its applications was limited at best. Both teams define “nigga’s” as queer, without effective theoretical application, and defining it thusly was done specifically to provide a competitive advantage. Without an effective definition of the theory, they presupposed its goals and theoretical applications, as seen in, the second opposition speech by Towson.

They say the niggas always already queer, that’s exactly the point! It means the impact is that the that the is the impact term, uh, to the afraid, uh, the, that it is a case turn to the affirmative because, we, uh, we’re saying that queer bodies are not able to survive the necessarily means of the body.

Instead of speaking about queer theory and how it applies to the resolution, they used it to formulate a competitive arena that ignored the resolution completely.

Delphic theoretical communication is harmful to both the debaters and the audience because it confuses the ideas rather than clarify them, and is done solely for the point of winning. According to McGee, judges typically provide feedback that undergirds and promotes this type of behavior (1998). Throughout the round, both the Affirmative and Negative teams embraced the theatrical over the theoretical. When they gave evidence or quoted an author, the speakers strayed from the expository tone they were using and shift inflection to focus the audience on their performance, as in this example: “When the nigga, uh, sees these pains and suffering that he can only, uh, envision himself that he, uh, does not see another nigga that he, uh, can feel sympathy for or embrace, but rather, uh, that, a-bluh, that that otherness gets obliterated.” Here, the concept of otherness was completely miscued and misrepresented. The debater never addressed how otherization occurs or the necessity of the majority in limiting otherness. In the middle of the performance, they simply stopped and maintained that “otherness gets obliterated” because “uh, envision himself that he, uh, does not see another nigga that he, uh, can feel sympathy for or embrace, but rather, uh, that, a-bluh.” This example reveals Delphic theoretical

communication and the performative tactics; it shows how the debaters did not deal effectively with the theory in question.

Another example from the round may be seen in the following:

Uh, says that the the the way status co works is through, uh, whiteness allowing, uh, forcing other bodies to tell, uh, nearations of whiteness in, uh, the violences that whiteness does me, uh, say that that is the link that we will go for!

In this example, the actual presentation of whiteness is nearly incoherent and is without merit in the explanation provided is without merit, what is implied, though, is the assertion that the United States government has waged a war on blacks. While many critical scholars may agree with the assumption, the use of whiteness in this argument is incorrect. The alternative right view of violence being a benchmark of the theory is absent from research. However, since the team from Towson won the round, apparently the judges were not concerned with proper theory application, as much as they were persuaded by the performative aspects of their case. Had they failed to vote for a winner and instead wrote ballots that rejected this behavior, subsequent debaters would have rejected this model. Instead, it was reinforced in the judging paradigm, and those who recognize its success in the CEDA finals will now embrace it.

Judging paradigms should also prioritize effective understanding of theory over extensive amassing of evidence of theory. A debater who can read ten cards on a theory does not necessarily have an effective understanding of what is being read. Neither does simply reading cards mean that effective argumentation is occurring. What it does mean is that the competitor is able to read fast and chooses to focus on judging expectations for extensive evidence. Not all educational benefit is lost, but it could be enhanced with effective paradigms, and the result would be better for intercollegiate debate.

*Spreading and Speed*

While the term “spreading” may have a plethora of possible meanings, it has specific meaning within the context of intercollegiate debate. In that arena, spreading is a tactic that combines the presentation of evidence with speed. This combination works to provide so much evidence on the judge’s flow sheet that the opposing team cannot respond to all of the evidence within the time limit of the round. To assist this tactic is a practice of arguing that occurs at the line-by-line analysis level. If a debate team can read 30 cards, and the opposing team fails to respond to one of them, or if a line of their argument is not addressed, the argument or the evidence is said to be “dropped” by the opposition. When that happens, the result is assumed to be that the “spread team” should be awarded the win.

Of course, this tactic and its outcome are sophistic in nature and contrary to Aristotelian principles. Intercollegiate debate competition was developed to provide an educational activity for examining contrasting ideas, practicing effective delivery, and developing a deeper understanding of the topic resolutions (Cates & Evans, 2010). Most debate organizations, including CEDA, initially adhered to this philosophy, which is why competitive debate topics are limited to a semester, to limit the overuse of evidence by spread teams. When this limitation did not fix the problem, multiple debate organizations moved to a format that released the topic just prior to the round of competition, to limit the amount of evidence presented and to increase the efficacy of preparation by the participants (Cates & Eaves, 2010).

Many debate programs have graduate researchers and entire research teams that only work to “cut cards.” They prepare all the evidence for the competition by taking specific sections of the case and placing evidence for each in small sound bites for the team members. Of course, debaters who have not done their own research perpetuate the occurrence of Delphic

theory communication. It also means they are simply there to read as fast as they can, while attempting to create links to and within their opponent's cases (Cates & Eaves, 2010).<sup>34</sup>

This style moves away from an extemporaneous speaking style, with an emphasis on education and learning, to one that embraces gameplaying and spreading, contrary to the assumed goals of academic debate. A key aspect of having alternating resolutions was so participants would be able to use critical decision-making skills to solve problems, to connect arguments, and to apply those skills and knowledge within the real world (Cates & Eaves, 2010).

The debate community recognizes that judges are needed to train debaters in presentation and critical thinking (Kuster, Olson, & Loging, 2000). Part of that process is to discourage the overuse of evidence, spreading, speed, and gamesmanship (Kuster, Olson, & Loging, 2000). However, since most judging pools are former debaters and coaches, they tend to lean towards coaching debaters on how to win, which encourages spreading and speed and limits the benefits mentioned.

The 2014 CEDA final round clearly illustrates this tactic of overuse of evidence and spreading, which reached incoherency on multiple occasions and filled the room with “uh, uh, uh and the, the, the, du, du du.” The words spoken were nearly unrecognizable, often the intent, as well. At one point, the Negative Towson team member read so low her voice was unintelligible. This tactic was accepted by the judges on their flow sheet. Note the following passage from the Affirmative Oklahoma team:

They say the niggas always already queer, that's exactly the point! It means the impact is that the that the is the impact term, uh, to the afraid, uh, the, that it is a case turn to the affirmative because, we, uh, we're saying that queer bodies are not able to survive the necessarily means of the body. Uh, uh, the nigga is not able to survive.

---

<sup>34</sup> The difference between sophistic and Aristotelian values for debate, as used here, is discussed fully in Chapter 1.

The intersection of debate jargon (case turn), with theory (queer) and speed result in an enormous amount of words being placed on the flow, with the intent to cause the opposition to drop one line and cause to their ultimate demise. Both teams engaged this tactic throughout the round.

Debaters' reliance upon judging paradigms, such as those provide by Mike Baush in the CEDA final round, tended to cause or reinforce this:

I prioritize voting for high quality evidence in my decision-making. If you take time to compare your evidence (claims, data, warrants) to your opponent's evidence I will try to default to your assessment as much as possible, and extend your skepticism to a limited degree. If I am given no instruction, then I will read evidence and dismiss arguments that are not effectively supported in favor of better-supported arguments.

From this statement, we can see Baush's bias toward evidence, amounts of evidence, and his or her belief about the judge's role in evidence interpretation. Accordingly, debaters facing this Baush in the final round could assume that providing excessive evidence would be a winning strategy and that if their opponents failed to address any of their evidence, the judge would use this reason to vote against the competitors and for them. In fact, this reasoning is the core doctrine of spreading.

Beth Mendenhall maintained that the card, or evidence itself, would usurp the critical decision-making and persuasiveness of the debater: "Generally, I only do so to resolve a close, single-issue but many-card debate (like politics uniqueness) or to resolve a dispute about the content of a card." Yet Christopher Kozak provided what might be the most damaging paradigm regarding evidence and spreading: "It may sound like I have a lot of 'biases' but I do honestly try to evaluate arguments exactly as debaters tell me to. These preferences mostly come into play only when debaters are not doing their jobs."<sup>35</sup>

---

<sup>35</sup> The text for these judging paradigms is provided in APPENDIX C.

A key assumption about the relationship between debate and the development of critical thinking is that debaters understand their evidence and that they extend their understanding through effective argumentation, but to foster that relationship, the judge must understand both the theory and its application and be able to assess the credibility of the debaters' arguments. If the role of judges is to only believe what debaters tell them about the evidence, why should any even be presented? The role of the debater should be to learn how to understand the case for better argumentation. Spreading leads them to reach for breadth of arguments, over depth of understanding, and then to make arguments based on their own interpretation. If the judge's paradigm requires that, then it is reinforcing negative aspects of spreading. Again, this approach is rightly regarded as sophistical in nature because it can lead to an emphasis of weak arguments over strong in order to win.

### *Gamesmanship*

Another major factor to emerge from analysis of the CEDA final round is clear evidence that both teams fully embraced gamesmanship. Instead of dealing with the resolution, both Towson and Oklahoma determined that they could change the rules of debate because they deemed the rules unfair and "otherizing."<sup>36</sup> They then proceeded to address the war on blacks by the U.S. government. The goal of both teams was ultimately to win the tournament and to talk about their preferred topics, regardless of the stated goals of the tournament.

The inclusion of performance and music provided effective theatre and allowed for additional debate aspects such as speed. At one point, the team from Oklahoma started rapping:

Some say the blacker the berry, the sweeter the juice  
I say the darker the flesh then the deeper the roots  
I give a holla to my sisters on welfare

---

<sup>36</sup> Otherizing is when a dominant group places a minority group into the role of the 'other' and subsequently attempt to establish their identity. This is often accompanied by vilification of the "Other." For further information see <https://othersociologist.com/otherness-resources/>.

2Pac cares, if don't nobody else care. (Tupac Shakur,1998)

There are those within the intercollegiate debate community who support this type of performance for debate. Specifically, the president of CEDA, Paul Mabrey offered the following statement in defense of this round of debate:

To an outsider, this contestation may be confusing or frustrating, but in the academic world of debate this contestation is what makes the activity innovative. The ability to innovate is necessary to be successful in any field, and debate trains innovation better than other activities. (APPENDIX B)

Clearly, Mabrey makes note of the separation between real-world application and the “academic world of debate,” an indication that to be successful debaters must focus first on the gamesmanship rather than academic learning.

The judging paradigms within the final round reinforced performative gamesmanship. Deven Cooper states, “Performance: It must be linked to an argument that is able to defend the performance and be able to explain the overall impact on debate or the world itself. Please don’t do a performance to just do it...you MUST have a purpose and connect it to arguments.” Here, Cooper never clarifies that the performance needs to deal with the resolution. The performance must be able to be defended by the debaters by connecting it somehow to their argument. In this case they never addressed the resolution.

The move toward gamesmanship is no accident however. Judges and associations prefer teams who win rounds over teams who try to learn the educational aspects of debate (Dalton & Pross, 1954). Teams are taught that they are successful in debate if they win, not if they present well founded arguments (Mazilu, 2002). The difference has been discussed in academic circles for several decades, often with much conflict and little if any resolution (Brennan, 2011). Judges, coaches, and administrative officials determine the effects of their program based on the number of wins their team receives (Mazilu, 2002). When teams win rounds, tournaments, or speaker

trophies, the assumption is that the program is academically successful. The judgment of the program's administration is comparable to other athletic activity; the correlation between winning and educational value is assumed (Padrow, 1956). In many ways, by showing how many wins their teams have is how coaches are able to stay employed.

Over fifty years ago, this consequence of gamesmanship was identified as being problematic and has not changed drastically since then. Intercollegiate debate has the potential to be nothing more than an arena for competition (Burnett, Brand, & Meister, 2003). Those who work with debaters are often referred to as coaches, rather than professors, instructors, or even teachers. To enhance that role, rather than to reinforce their educational responsibilities, they hold tournaments aimed in qualification, playoffs, and championships and even offer awards (Burnett, Brand, & Meister, 2003).

This is a key reason why judging paradigms are so important. If judging ballots reinforce critical aspects of theory and argumentation, then debaters will tend to seek that reinforcement. However, judges reinforce why teams won or lost on their RFD more often than they provide criticism of the argument (Burnett, Brand, & Meister, 2003). Some have even gone so far as to call the idea that education is the basis of debate a myth (Guerin, Labor, Morgan, & Willingham, 1979). If intercollegiate debate promotes the idea of education, but only functions to perpetuate competition and winning, then it becomes nothing more than sport, developing a specific competitive culture with rules for acting within that game (Burke, 1947). Provision of a new shared paradigm could change that.

#### *The Glass Bead Game as a Rhetorical Lens*

A rhetorical lens affords us a better understanding of the current state of intercollegiate debate. The purpose of a rhetorical lens is to use one scenario to create understanding in another

(Burke, 1947). As noted in Chapter 1, this study has used *The Glass Bead Game* (Hesse, 1943) to reveal the problems with gamesmanship when it is placed ahead of education and understanding. In his fictional work, Hesse was able to provide a unique perspective based on his training as an anthropologist. The text was written in an ethnographic fashion and provides deep understanding of culture, tradition, and purpose. It also shows points of contradiction when a culture moves a value to a position of gamesmanship. *The Glass Bead Game* provides an effective lens for reviewing the current state of intercollegiate debate because debate's rich history and tradition conflict with its current practice.

Hesse (1943) relates the use of glass beads and the game which was developed for use with them. Simply stated, the bead game was created to assist its players in the attainment and application of mental and spiritual virtues. When used, the game was to be a tool, which led to enlightenment. However, the game itself was performed by a group of elitists, and they quickly began to focus on the mastery of the game, not the attainment of enlightenment. Hesse uses the character of Josef Knecht to identify how easily the goal could be misconstrued. Instead of enlightenment, Knecht embraced the game competition itself. The mental simulation achieved, through intellectual engagement with the game, caused the purpose of the game to fade quickly. It was through the death of Knecht that Hesse exposes arrogance, elitism, and a focus on form over outcome. The character was so perpetually focused on the rules of the game that the value of attaining spiritual enlightenment was lost.

We can see how this lens applies to competitive intercollegiate debate, created to advance public speaking, teach critical thinking, and to foster sound argumentative skills (McGee & McGee, 2000). The advantages of developing such skills in students can easily justify the economic investment by colleges and universities in debate programs, as well as the time

investment of both judges and participants. For this reason, Cirlin argues, the focus of intercollegiate debate was meant to be on education more than competition (1998). Colleges sending their students to debate tournaments send them into a unique training area, where rhetorical effectiveness was assumed to take precedent. However, very quickly colleges began to focus on competition because of the growth of debate (Cirlin, 2007). As the focus became competition, many within intercollegiate debate seemed to forget the primary goal was education. Subsequently, debate became a competitive environment where the initial goal of education no longer seemed to be the key driver (Guerin, Labor, Morgan, & Willingham, 1979).

When education fails to be the primary focus, gamesmanship and winning prevail. This subtle transition is significant because when it occurs, the focus moves to rules over intent. The rules then become subjects of argument, instead of merely guidelines for coaching (Potter, 1947). The original goal of education is presupposed but may not even occur (Guerin, Labor, Morgan, & Willingham, 1979). It is easy to recognize what has occurred. Delphic theoretical communication and spreading, as well as general gamesmanship, have taken precedence over critical thinking and education for the purpose of winning. Competition is not a necessary evil; however, when it assumes the capstone position, it is problematic.

As judges focus on gamesmanship, they look at rules and how they are exploited to win. They become elitist in their actions, feedback, and responses. They behave just as those within *The Glass Bead Game*. Judging perspectives begin to focus on the technical aspects of debate, as they embrace hegemonic jargon that exiles non-speakers. They promote the game over the purpose. Intellectual stimulation occurs from arguing about the game to a point where the purpose of the game is no longer the driving factor, if it is even important. The participants then adhere to the rules because they want to win. The paradigm causes, or at the least reinforces, the

problems within intercollegiate debate. When the debate community takes more pride about the ability to debate about the rules than about the educational outcomes, the participants are behaving just as Hess's Castalians. In the text, Hesse uses Knecht's death and afterlife to show the failure of this type of outcome.

The debate community must recognize the fallacy. Just because a group is exclusive through jargon, speed, and technical communication, does not establish the educational value of the groups activity. The way to correct this disorientation is to visit the judging paradigms within a round. As these models are adjusted, debater behavior should follow. Providing a universal paradigm also frees debaters to focus on argumentation, presentation, and persuasion. The current multi-paradigm within rounds forces competitors to perform to the model of the judge because coaches and administration want a win. These two do not have to be mutually exclusive. Each may be accomplished in the right scenario. It is with this in mind, the next chapter, chapter 3, works to synthesize the theories of Aristotle, Cicero, and Whately to provide a new common judging paradigm.

## CHAPTER 3

### THEORY SYNTHESIS

For judges to provide more than win/loss judgments, to educate student competitors effectively about the power of debate training, they must incorporate the use of argument theory and address the effective use of rhetorical principals. To accomplish this educational goal, judges need to have a congruent judging paradigm that would allow debaters to have some instruction about the development of their arguments. An effective rhetorical paradigm could reinforce instruction, while discouraging performance tactics based on gamesmanship. Unfortunately, since competing research and scholarly articles have fostered disagreement in the academic community about the value of rhetorical theory for debate activity,<sup>37</sup> we need to find the theoretical principles offered by rhetorical theorists, both recent and past, that establish grounds for collaboration on this goal (Brummett, 2014). To establish a platform for developing an effective rhetorical paradigm for intercollegiate debate judges, coaches, and participants, this chapter offers the results of theory synthesis.

Theory synthesis has been shown to be valuable in advancing academic research and providing theory congruency (Turner, 1990). Theory synthesis provides an opportunity to break from established theories and to find more effective solutions to problems by taking a holistic approach and applying different theory combinations to resolve them (Hellmann, 2003). Some scholars reject the idea of pluralism while seeking singular approaches. However, it should be noted that theory synthesis allows for cumulative application of theory (Sibeon, 2004). The

---

<sup>37</sup>See Llano's (2016) *The counterfeit presentment: An early 20th century model of intercollegiate debate as civic education*. He shows the dichotomy of William Hawley Davis and James M. O'Neill critiques of debate modes.

opportunity to focus specifically on the theories allows for a deeper understanding of their similarities and differences. Effective theory synthesis then includes finding similarity, even though the theories themselves may contain differing positions or traditions (Turner, 1990).

To understand existing models of debate and to provide clarification regarding their differences, this process of synthesis provides theoretical simplification as well as a potential new theoretical perspective. J. Turner (1990) has provided a model that is useful for driving the process of theory synthesis. In chapter 2, I engaged in simple synthesis preparation for the literature review section, which was a discussion of the relevant aspects of the theory for a new debate judging paradigm. Herein, I am synthesizing the rhetorical theories of Aristotle, Cicero, and Whately, beginning with a process of comparison and contrast.

According to J.C. McCroskey (2015), modern debate was born through a rhetorical lens. What he means by that is, from its inception, classical rhetoric was focused on developing techniques for speakers to create effective arguments and discourse, whether in the courtroom, political fora, or public assemblies. Aristotle was responsible for synthesizing many of these techniques into a coherent theory, an art of civic discourse, which was both pragmatic and philosophical (Kennedy, 2015). He justified rhetoric, saying its practice was necessary to society and its skills could enable the speaker to discover the possible means of persuasion in any given case. He explained that audiences are not always interested in mere facts, so rhetorical skill is often needed to establish the truth or to defend it against falsehood (Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 1.1.14). To construct a common judging paradigm for intercollegiate debate, then, it seems appropriate to begin with theoretical concepts central to Aristotle's rhetorical art.

Fundamental to his rhetorical theory is his analysis of artistic proof, comprised of *ethos*, *pathos*, and *en auto to logo*. This analysis of how speakers invent persuasive discourse was

adopted by most rhetoricians throughout subsequent centuries, including both Cicero and Whately, and it still has theoretical value for any analysis of discourse today. Audiences still look for demonstration of character and credibility, *ethos*, in the presentation of speakers. In debate, it is imperative that the speaker reaches a place of believability. The ability to be succinct, accurate, and focused with the evidence enhances the *ethos* of the debater for most judges. Debaters often use evidence as a means of establishing their credibility but ignore the impact of their own demeanor as perceived by their audience. Techniques of a speaker to employ emotional appeal, *pathos*, such as using metaphors or vivid narration, work to engage the hearers personally in the argument or the case presented. The use of logical reasoning within a case, *en auto to logo*, either inductively or deductively, enhances the accessibility of the argument as it is developed for the audience.

These fundamentals of rhetoric are often overlooked or under employed, due to the absence of a cohesive judging paradigm. Speaker credibility is more than being able to announce to the judges that the opposing team dropped a line of analysis. As noted throughout chapters 1 and 2, debaters know that their presentation must be directed to the judge to garner the ballot at the end of the round. In chapter 2, the analysis of the CEDA round showed that both the affirmative and negative teams attempted to create *ethos* through use of evidence, as well as invoking judging paradigms, within the round. The attempt to create credibility was clear; however, they did not demonstrate understanding of the theories they used, and so, for the judges who voted against them, they probably lost credibility. Further, both teams used performance, embracing the internal judging paradigms of several of the judges, which left them with poor argument construction. This choice was based, no doubt, on judging criterion offered prior to the start of the final round. However, debaters should be encouraged by judges to construct

arguments in presentations in a way that provide *ethos* effectively. Likewise, correctly applied *pathos* and *logos* are necessary for debaters to add to their skillset for real-world applications. If the required to place emphasis on effective argumentation, debaters will shift away from mere gamesmanship in the round.

Through a rhetorical lens, a good debater, just as any other public speaker, would make use of three modes of proof when constructing and presenting his or her case: logical reasoning (*en auto to logo*), audience appeals (*pathos*), and speaker credibility (*ethos*). Yet we can see from the case study in Chapter 2 how logical reasoning and speaker credibility were misconstrued, often for the sake of obtaining audience acceptance. One example is when the Oklahoma team attempted to use both queer theory and emotional appeal.

They say the niggas always already queer, that's exactly the point! It means the impact is that the that the is the impact term, uh, to the afraid, uh, the, that it is a case turn to the affirmative because, we, uh, we're saying that queer bodies are not able to survive the necessarily means of the body. Uh, uh, the nigga is not able to survive.

The intent in using queer theory seemed to be to establish credibility and sound reason; however, it was done incoherently, and with an emphasis on performance. Thus, the greater focus was on audience appeal rather than on reason. They made the same error again with the following:

Uh, man's sole jabringing object disfigure religion trauma and nubs, uh, the, inside the trauma of representation that turns into the black child devouring and identifying with the stories and into the white culture brought up, uh, de de de de de, dink, and add subjectively like a white man, the black man!

Again, performance was utilized for audience appeal but failed to attain credibility or to provide effective reasoning. The 2014 CEDA championship was a collision of *pathos* and performance, but lacked the necessary filter for effective coaching, judging, or decision making in the round.

Aristotle recognized that effective or persuasive is invented in response to a specific situation or occasion that has a definite purpose. Consequently, understanding the purpose to be

served would improve the appropriateness of choices made by the speaker. For Aristotle, all occasions for rhetoric could be classified within three types or species: forensic, deliberative, and epideictic. Each type allows the rhetor specific opportunity within the argument. From the standpoint of debate, where the main purpose is arguing the merits of a hypothetical proposition, each Aristotelian type offers some argumentative strategies.

Forensic rhetoric, which is concerned with judging past events through accusation and defense, often focuses on how to determine or to define truth in contrast with events that can be shown to be false, to separate guilt from innocence (McCroskey, 2015). Deliberative rhetoric is concerned with determining future events through comparative advantage or disadvantage and often focuses on predictions of how certain actions may impact society. Aristotle said epideictic rhetoric was used to affirm social values for the community through public displays of praise or blame. McCroskey comments that epideictic rhetoric affords the speaker the best opportunity to show his or her artistic skill (2015).

Intercollegiate debate is full of resolutions that allow debaters the opportunity to challenge issues within the *status quo*. Whether socially, politically, or economically based, debates provide a platform to discuss real world issues and thus impact societal view through their audience. The more effective debaters are in their presentation, the more their specific critique will be adapted. In the 2014 CEDA final round each team could have utilized these three purposes to advance the actual resolution to a ballot for their team. They were given this resolution:

**RESOLVED:** The United States Federal Government should substantially increase statutory and/or judicial restrictions on the war powers authority of the President of the United States in one or more of the following areas: targeted killing; indefinite detention; offensive cyber operations; or introducing United States Armed Forces into hostilities.

The affirmative team could have employed forensic rhetoric to show how prior application of federal powers, although well intended, had negative societal impacts. Examples such as the rise of the Nazi regime in Germany, during World War II, could have been provided. Deliberative rhetoric would have allowed them to do a comparative analysis of those outcomes on future societies. Finally, epideictic rhetoric could have applied the values of democracy to blame the failures on governmental checks. The negative team could have used the same series of arguments, in a juxtaposed position, to make each of the counter arguments. As a result, the judges would have been able to weigh the cost, benefits, and values of the resolution.

As did his mentor, Plato, Aristotle opposed using rhetoric as the sophists did, to exploit rhetorical techniques merely to win disputes rather than to persuade the audience through a sound argument (McCroskey, 2015). On this point, according to Nathan Crick, Richard Whately seems to find consistency with Aristotle, while Cicero focuses more often on what persuades the audience and less on argument principles (2013). In his masterwork, *De oratore*, Cicero finds a middle ground between abstract principles of argumentation and technical practice and advocates that the ideal orator must be both wise and eloquent – wisdom from education and eloquence from the principled rhetorical training of natural talent.<sup>38</sup> This agreement among the three authors suggest that a continuous emphasis on both is desirable. Judges should comprehensively remind and reward debaters for accomplishing them congruently. Again, the goal is not the necessary elimination of competition from intercollegiate debate but a higher emphasis on effective training of the debater. Thus, these commonalities allow for application of Aristotelian concepts of occasion and purpose in the development of sound argumentation in intercollegiate debate.

---

<sup>38</sup> Cicero, M. (1942). Book 1, *De oratore*.

Some scholars view rhetoric as a field of judgment.<sup>39</sup> For example, rhetoric can easily be used to decide whether speakers are using information to unveil the truth, or if they are attempting to cause the audience to accept the speaker's position through persuasion. From an Aristotelian perspective, rhetorical skill is mostly concerned with the process of making a judgment and communicating that judgment effectively to the audience; whereas, the audience mostly tends to analyze the *ethos* of the speaker, rather than the matter at hand. Aristotle argued that linguistic style, that is, correct and appropriate language use, were necessary to the rhetor (*Rhetoric III*). Aristotle was critical of the Sophists, who accepted making the weaker side of an argument stronger for the purposes of winning. Aristotelian rhetoric should be understood as learning how to find means of persuasion, available for use in a specific argument, but with the purpose of presenting the truth persuasively, not winning (Crick, 2013).

Westwick and Chromey (2014) attribute the formulaic stages of speech development to Aristotle; however, it was Cicero who discussed the five powers of the orator (Cicero, *De invention*). These stages correspond to the classical canon of Roman rhetoric:

- Invention, concerned with judging what is the purpose and the support for the argument to be made, along with determining the most compelling ways of formulating the actual arguments to be used in a debate.
- Arrangement, the process of organizing the overall speech in a logical manner, as well as of ordering the specific parts of the argument.
- Linguistic Style, the process of selecting the most appropriate and engaging language in a debate to assist understanding, engagement, and acceptance.

---

<sup>39</sup> See Cirlin, A. (2007). Academic debate v. advocacy in the real-world: A comparative analysis.

- Memory, making use of mnemonics or other memory skills to aid accessing all parts of the presentation -- its style, order, and argumentative substance.
- Delivery, presenting the speech in an effective manner through vocal projection, facial expression, and appropriate hand and body movements.

In my view, modes of expression and the rhetorical canon of classical rhetoric must inherently be included as part of this synthesis of rhetorical theory. Using invention debaters can focus on argument construction in such a way that allows them to be meaningful as well as compelling. Invention skills require both critical thinking in decision making and persuasive techniques in presentation. Principles of arrangement teach debaters how to think logically to construct their arguments. Effective application of linguistic necessitates analyzing the in order to become cognitively involved with the audience and assist their understanding of the arguments. Memory shows authentication and ownership of the material, and delivery allows for expert delivery of the materials. All of these skills should be embraced in intercollegiate debate activity.

An investigation of the main contributions of Cicero and Whately to the rhetorical tradition provides a clear picture of their similarity to Aristotle. The rhetorical canon became solidified in Cicero's Rome. There it was taught to develop the ability for delivering a high-quality speech or an excellent presentation in debate. Both Cicero and Whately endorse the process of the rhetorical canon and its importance. Cicero argues that eloquence is the most critical, while Whately places eloquence after invention and arrangement, in terms of significance. What is fundamental, though, is the commonality of agreement regarding the canon. This agreement sets a standard framework for reviewing rhetoric. Incorporating the rhetorical canon into a judging paradigm reinforces effective use by the debater and more accessibility to both knowledge and understanding by the audience. As stated above, use of the

canon leads to more effective critical decision making, better argument construction, logical thought, audience participation and effective delivery and engagement.

Aristotle, Cicero, and Whately find it necessary for argument to be both informative and compelling, accompanied with logical development and effective presentation, in a manner that is persuasive to the audience (Condor et al., 2013). The manner in which the speech is given, its presentation, delivery, and language use are all inclusive in good argumentation. As such, the canon inherently must be included in the theoretical framework of any debate paradigm. Not only does it provide direction for construction, it also excludes the use of speed within the round as a competitive tool, because it simply violates the other rhetorical principals. Theatrical or artistic performance within a debate round would be limited, as well as inappropriate gesturing, stuttering, yelling and non-specific analysis.

Cicero proposes that all arguments should be supported by proof, while Whately tempers that idea by acknowledging that occasionally, some cases do not need further evidence (Condor et al., 2013). This point is an important one, particularly as noted throughout chapter 2.<sup>40</sup> In the case study, the overuse of evidence was a tactic for winning. Excessive evidence reporting can create an advantage through spreading and line by line analysis. The result is often arguments that are weak, unclear, and designed only for competitive advantage. In addition, when emphasis is on the amount of evidence given, debaters read as fast as possible and in tones that are unintelligible. Ultimately, the lack of clarity should fail to impact the judges or participants. However, it must be noted that the norm in intercollegiate debate to synthesize evidence to establish the argument is valuable.

---

<sup>40</sup> Refer to discussion of the case study in chapter 2.

Cicero and Whately also appear to agree on the aspect of evidence, through the lens of invention. Whately agrees with Aristotle's view of rhetoric as an art that effects persuasion. Cicero tends to see persuasion as the outcome audience appeals or *pathos* (Condor et al., 2013). The triune each support the use of *ethos* and *pathos* in rhetorical proof. Clearly argument formation and presentation are accomplished more effectively in intercollegiate debate with the addition of evidentiary support. Quality evidence is effective in determining its persuasive outcomes, and in-depth research on the topic under discussion should support the debater's thesis (Cohen, & Wellman, 2014). The evidence should buoy an argument, not be the primary value of it; debate judging paradigms should embrace supported argument and reject spreading aimed at winning. Debaters must embrace the idea that rhetoric is not just a speech meant to persuade, but it is any purposive communication effort, especially those argumentative in nature (Haapala, 2016). An effective debate judging paradigm should embrace the usage of practical arguments, sufficient research, and critical thinking concerning the topic being debated (Davis et al., 2016).

Cicero and Whately also concur with Aristotle's topical invention. Topical invention identifies common lists of arguments, lines of thought, and accepted reasons which presenters could employ for building their case or selecting evidence (Condor et al., 2013). Topical invention can be defined even further as "a system that can draw one's thoughts to be the best hunting grounds where ideas suitable to a particular speaking assignment can be found" (Wilson & Arnold, 1964, p. 96). It may be limiting to call topics mere headings, but the formulation of thoughts together, which allow clarity and fullness of thought, are necessary for effective rhetoric. Theories frequently used in intercollegiate debate fail to offer consistently relevant frameworks or methodologies. As such, debate judges often fail to apply a set of standards that

focus on developing critical thinking, persuasive skills, or analytical processes. Instead they focus on identifying the winning debater, rewarding gamesmanship.

The ineffectiveness of the such judging models, their lack of adaptability to the challenges facing the debate community, and their lack of consistency call for action in improving the paradigm. An effective debate judging paradigm must, therefore, hold the judges accountable for what makes learn in the debate, requiring judges to ponder critical issues concerning the way they are going to carry out their duties. First, judges need to ask themselves how their judging philosophy concerns the outcome of the debate (Freshwater & Cahill, 2013). Judges must be reminded that the feedback they provide to debaters becomes the primary concern within the round. Debaters look to the judge as their only audience and therefore the key to win a debate round. If the judge maintains an academic and rhetorical focus in conducting the round, debaters will adapt to that focus.

Next, there must be an academic consistency among judges and the expectations of debaters. Due to a lack of consistent established theoretical paradigms for judges, there is no consistency for a debater to learn. If judges have their own paradigms, and debaters must adjust to individual judge's paradigms, the outcome is primarily gamesmanship, not a focus on the arguments made or interrogated in the round. Providing a common model allows for measurable outcome against a stated goal. It does not eliminate gamesmanship; it simply connects it to academic goals. Critical thinking, argument construction, research and proper theory construction should always usurp the simplicity of win or lose.

An effective paradigm must choose either an internal or external model (Freshwater & Cahill, 2013). As seen in the case study, multiple judging paradigms misconstrue the two into a conglomeration that is neither academically sound or useful. Confusion from telling debaters that

the judge is “tabula rasa”, and then expecting them to provide a framework, causes a distinct lack of understanding of either model. Members of the academic debate community argue that education occurs when debaters must adapt to varying judging philosophies and when they have to debate by applying different performance styles (Van Eemeren et al., 2014). However, paradigms which cause debaters to mix methods, theories and applications, while weakening their understanding of each are problematic because they prevent most judges from determining practical outcomes of a debate round (Shafer, 2014). We need to reject this paradigm as the highest educational value in debate (Guerin, et al., 2005). As seen throughout the review of literature and subsequent analysis, Aristotle, Cicero, and Whately fundamentally agree on the desired framework for debate, and the framework provides a paradigm we could use for judging. Simply noted, the paradigm framework is the construct upon which judges rely to ensure effective rhetorical feedback is provided, to give continuity in purpose to debaters, and to be consist in their feedback. Thus, a rhetorical judging paradigm (RJP) should have clear focus on the desired outcomes of an Aristotelian perspective, a search for truth tested against an external paradigm. The use of an external paradigm will allow for greater emphasis on the evidence of the rhetorical canon and real-world focus, while limiting both technical aspects of debate and gamesmanship.

The internal paradigm promotes the concepts of gamesmanship over those of education. As noted in chapter 1, internal paradigms force debaters to focus on the mechanics of debate over the critical thinking component. This conclusion is reinforced by judges who view themselves as debate rule and contention critics<sup>41</sup> (Geradin & McCahery, 2005). Judges who are

---

<sup>41</sup>The case study in chapter 2 looked at individual judging paradigms that reflect the mechanics of debate as being more important than the critical thinking and argumentative purposes.

allowed to expect debaters to focus on the mechanics, or merely technical aspects of debate, become biased against those debaters who do not adhere to them. Debaters who do not maintain the internal paradigm are disadvantaged (Banks, 1985). Judges view themselves as critics of contentions, and as a result, debaters are forced to focus on the mechanics of debates rather than traditional paradigms of argumentation. The contradiction causes a dynamic where evidence is presented as secondary, if at all. Competitors are forced to argue over rules instead of the resolution to win the judges ballot. The result is most judges are usually not concerned with correcting poor academic practices but instead promote ridiculous arguments and vague or ambiguous evidence (Guerin, et al., 2005). Judges tend to intervene in an argument whenever an opportunity presents itself, if the proposed arguments violate their individual paradigms (Freeley, & Steinberg, 2013).

Internal judging paradigms embrace nothingness or neutrality, with the expectation that the debaters themselves establish the rules and relative truth (Geradin & McCahrey, 2005), which cause debaters to focus more on the rules of debate than the content of the round. Judging paradigms should embrace an external model for debate. Whately focused on the concept of applying rhetoric to debates in a practical and argumentative manner (Haapala, 2016). Debaters should be able to present a case to the judge that offers a proper framework to either support or oppose the resolution in the round. Simply stated, judging paradigms should require the debaters to either oppose or to support the issue outlined for discussion. If not, debate rounds will continue to resemble the 2014 CEDA final round.

#### Rhetorical Judging Paradigm

The synthesis of these theories provides a lens for developing a new paradigm for use by judges within intercollegiate debate. As the literature review and previous synthesis of theory

show, there is an extensive amount of agreement that allows for the introduction of a new debate judging paradigm, if we accept the view that debate must be both argumentative in composition and persuasive in presentation. Judges need to be asked to judge both argument construct and persuasive technique. Whately (1963) believed that there should be a framework for argument that established rhetorical purposes. If a common judging paradigm were established it would provide debaters with a clear understanding of judging philosophies, give clarity to the judges on their specific judicial focuses and provide better audience understanding (McBath, 1984).

An external paradigm provides space for individuality in argument and presentation style but places an emphasis on real-world application. External paradigms focus on the content of the argument being presented by the debaters and are less judge-centric. As such, judges are required to focus more on the arguments within the round and to maintain a real-world focus; internal judging paradigms permit arguments that are both radical and non-resolutional. D'Souza stresses that external paradigms require judges to assess the ability of the debaters to address the resolution (2013). Notably, the presentations of CEDA finalists never directly addressed the resolution.

An external paradigm embraces research, critical thinking skills, effective presentation, and persuasiveness. It requires students to understand the resolution, develop argumentation for or against it, attain evidentiary support, and present their claims effectively. It also means they do not have to be responsible to develop a paradigm, to debate over the rules of the debate, or to adhere to problematic shifting philosophies from round to round. This change could have an immediate impact on the information within the round: focus for the round will be on the resolution and not on critical components that limit the inclusion of the non-debate community.

External paradigms also afford the inclusion from the aforementioned views regarding rhetoric from Aristotle, Cicero, and Whately. The melding of theory with an external paradigm creates an effective tool for judging intercollegiate debate. To use within a round, I submit two suggestions: first, train judges on the paradigms prior to allowing them in a debate round and second, issue a common ballot that includes the synthesized theory. For this study, I have developed a sample ballot that provides a lens for judges to view throughout the round. It asks them to recognize the appeals the students have implemented, the occasion addressed, specific application of canon in argument construction, as well as the use of evidence and persuasion.

The goal of college debate must be to maintain a clear hierarchy of education over gamesmanship. Judges may need to have more expertise in the art of rhetoric, at least more than they do in the use of shifting and individual paradigms, when adjudicating a debate round. If they offer input on how the competitors did with argument construction, theory application, and persuasive techniques on a specific resolution, then the competitors learn something about how to communicate well. This proposed model inherently competes with the nonsensical and shifting paradigms offered by Christopher Vincent prior to the 2014 CEDA final round, “All ethics challenges will be decided through the infamous RuPaul Paradigm: The Time Has Come for you to Lip Sync for your life.”

Below is the sample judging ballot which is derived from the synthesized rhetorical theory and which is referred to as the “rhetorical judging paradigm” or RJP. The rhetorical judging paradigm (RJP) should accompany the judges’ training on outcome paradigms, prior to the start of the tournament. The RJP provides effective theoretical understanding for the judges and can serve as a tool for effective feedback and commonality to debaters among coaches and judges. Adoption of the RJP does not eliminate gamesmanship in intercollegiate debate;

competitions is beneficial to learning because it is motivating. It could link competition more successfully to educational outcomes. The judge should be required to circle the corresponding choice on the sheet of level of performance in relation to the specific theory-driven criterion. Included with the sheet is a rubric to provide direction and understanding of argument theory for the judge as well. Additionally, there is a feedback and coaching RFD section and speaker point award opportunities.

Figure 1

<b>The RJP (RHETORICAL JUDGING PARADIGM) TOOL</b>									
<b>Judge:</b>					<b>Resolution:</b>				
<b>Affirmative</b>					<b>Negative</b>				
1. _____					1. _____				
2. _____					2. _____				
<b>1<sup>st</sup> Affirmative Speaker:</b>					<b>1<sup>st</sup> Negative Speaker:</b>				
<b>Overview</b>					<b>Overview</b>				
<b>Appeal</b>	Ethos	Logos	Pathos						
<b>Argument Frame</b>	Forensic	Deliberative	Epeideictic						
<b>Invention</b>		1	2	3	4				
<b>Arrangement</b>		1	2	3	4				
<b>Language Use</b>		1	2	3	4				
<b>Memory</b>		1	2	3	4				
<b>Delivery</b>		1	2	3	4				
<b>Evidence</b>		1	2	3	4				
<b>Persuasive Appeals</b>		1	2	3	4				
<b>2<sup>nd</sup> Affirmative Speaker:</b>					<b>2<sup>nd</sup> Negative Speaker:</b>				
<b>Overview</b>					<b>Overview</b>				
<b>Appeal</b>	Ethos	Logos	Pathos						
<b>Argument Frame</b>	Forensic	Deliberative	Epeideictic						
<b>Invention</b>		1	2	3	4				
<b>Arrangement</b>		1	2	3	4				
<b>Language Use</b>		1	2	3	4				
<b>Memory</b>		1	2	3	4				
<b>Delivery</b>		1	2	3	4				
<b>Evidence</b>		1	2	3	4				
<b>Persuasive Appeals</b>		1	2	3	4				

	<b>RHETORICAL JUDGING PARADIGM - RUBRIC</b>			
	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Invention</b>	Failed to formulate an effective argument	Provided an argument – but it was weak and failed to address the resolution	Argument was solid and addressed the resolution	Compelling argument, solidly developed and addressing the resolution
<b>Arrangement</b>	Little or no organizational structure	Organizational structure does not support or lead to the logical outcomes of the arguments.	Organizational structure supports the logic of the arguments and the overall case presentation	Exceptional use of order and structure, using previews, transitions, and summaries to assist the hearers
<b>Language Use</b>	Limited effort at clarity – insensitive to appropriate use for hearers	Some awareness of clear & appropriate use, but heavy use of jargon and slang	Clear, appropriate language presented effectively.	Clear, appropriate and compelling use of language Engages the hearers
<b>Memory</b>	Dependent on notes or rote memorization of script	Recall of case adequate but unable to give impromptu responses to opposition	Recall of case was appropriate and was able to respond to opposition	Solid recall of arguments, able to extemporize evidence-based responses to opposition
<b>Delivery</b>	Speed too fast and pronunciation unclear. Speech not intelligible	Speech adequate but aspects of delivery need work. Ineffective	Speech effective – vocal projection and gestures are appropriate.	Excellent speaking skills -- Speech delivery was engaging
<b>Evidence</b>	Little or no use of evidence and/or explanation.	Evidence given was irrelevant or not appropriate for the case.	Evidence given was relevant but inadequate.	Evidence was both relevant and sufficient to the overall argument.
<b>Persuasive Appeals</b>	Not persuasive – seemed unaware of audience.	Somewhat persuasive but limited use of audience appeals	Persuasive. Used audience appeals appropriately	Exceptional use of audience appeals. Compelling case



### *Use of the Rhetorical Judging Paradigm*

The criterion contained within the RJP are designed for a multi-purpose approach to intercollegiate debate. First, the RJP is designed to be a judging tool for the judges, one that includes the rhetorical canon, as well as a practical guide for round analysis. As such, the RJP causes the judges to be aware of the canon, offers feedback accordingly, helps the debaters understand how rhetoric assists them in critical thinking, and ensures that the resolution is dealt with correctly in their debate cases. Additionally, it assists the debaters in preparation for their debate round. They understand the judging paradigm prior to the tournament and apply rhetoric as their driving emphasis in case construction, delivery, persuasion, and attempts for a winning ballot. As the framework for critical decision in the participants, the RJP does not eliminate competition or gamesmanship. Nonetheless, a simple explanation of RJP illuminates how the paradigm supports the learning outcomes for intercollegiate debate.

Invention, the process of performing the initial analysis of the topic, is the opportunity for the debaters to recognize the key premise, discuss pros and cons, recognize advantages and disadvantages, create advocacy, and recognize major emotional issues, as well develop their arguments in a logical coherent manner, and construct their case. The invention process should be done with specificity to the resolution provided for the debate round. Following the RJP, the judge would determine the strength and effectiveness of the argument, whether it addressed the resolution completely, if the argument was adequately developed, and if the argument developed was persuasive based upon construct. The judging feedback based on the RJP would note failure to develop an effective argument, development of a weak argument, an argument built solidly on the resolution, or a argument constructed that was both clear and compelling. The judge has the ability then to discuss argument construction with the team in their RFD and to ensure they understand how the resolutional argument should have been developed.

With arrangement as a criterion, the RJP allows judges to discuss the organizational aspects of the debater's speeches. Arrangement is how the ideas were structured after they were developed in invention. Without effective structure, ideas and thoughts, can be shared in any fashion. However, proper arrangement allows the audience to move from idea, to understanding, then to a place of action. With the RJP, judges would be able to determine if debaters offered a clear introduction of the topic, provided tangible statements of facts, utilized supporting evidentiary proofs, maintained sensible construction, and moved the audience to a reasonably distinct conclusion. An effective structure also allows judges to recognize the true understanding of the resolution that the debaters have. If they fail to arrange their arguments coherently, the judge may discuss the lack of resolitional understanding. Here judges may determine how well the debaters attempt to assist their audience with structure to their argument. Is organizational structure there, but with no logical arguments? Do the arguments support their presentation? Do they provide exceptional order, structure, with a preview, transitions, and summaries?

Language use is unique, because unlike a focus on what is said, as with invention and arrangement, the focus is on the selection of the words used. Judges armed with the RJP may focus on the use of technicality in relationship to the audience or on the ability to use clear and concise language to articulate and to explain the argument to the audience. While intercollegiate debate is currently focused in technicality and jargon, the RJP guides the judges to determine if the language used is in correlation to the argument and to the resolution. If the debaters are not able to communicate the ideas clearly to their audience, if they fail to maintain language consistent to the resolution, or if the language is designed to be elitist or offensive to their audience, the judge will be able to articulate effective feedback. The RJP allows judicators to recognize a lack of clarity, insensitive language, jargon, and slang. It also allows them to

determine if the language assists in clearly presenting their argument, effectively conveying that argument to the audience, and providing compelling use of language to engage the audience.

According to both McKeon (1975) and Griffin (2006), memory deals with the understanding and knowledge of an argument, and not the act of memorization. This is an important aspect of the RJP, specifically when dealing with critical decision making. Memory works closely with invention, in that it relies upon understanding a topic to provide an extension of the argument. Memory also is used in a beneficial connection to arrangement, because it allows for a remembrance of past arguments and allows debaters to understand them to construct their next line of synthesized argumentation. Memory also serves to provide credibility to the audience, as it shows ownership of the topic, thus provoking credibility. For judges, memory helps whether or not debaters are only utilizing prescribed materials or rather implementing effective critical decision making to perform analysis, and then presenting their arguments based on real time idea conflicts. Judges then provide feedback to the debaters regarding the depth of their understanding of the topic or how they dealt with the resolution and arguments. Judges recognize dependence on notes and scripts, thus denoting a lack of understanding and ownership of the topic, whether they maintained specific recall to the opposition, and if the recall of arguments allowed them to extemporize appropriate responses to the opposition.

Whereas language use focuses on the use of words, delivery is focused on how something is spoken, including aspects of nonverbal communication. It includes aspects of elocution, how articulately, expressively, and clearly it is said, and whether it is intelligible and effective, not abusive to listeners. If debaters are spreading or employing technical debate jargon, the RJP provides a feedback mechanism. This would provide the additional benefit of guiding debaters to a presentation that is usable in real world situations, which would require critical thinking,

argument construction, and persuasive speaking. Judges would be able to discuss technique, gestures, projection, and whether the presentation engaged the audience.

The RJP also allows judges to provide feedback regarding the use of evidence within a round. As noted,<sup>42</sup> Plato feared an overdependence on manuscripts would lead to a loss of critical thinking, yet the overuse of evidence within intercollegiate debate has generated the same outcome. Debaters fail to synthesize arguments, provide counter arguments, or convince audiences through effective analysis. Instead, by conforming to judging paradigms that promote spreading, they maintain they won an argument because their opponent failed to address evidence that was “dropped.” Evidence within many rounds is never understood, explained, or presented to the audience in a persuasive manner. Evidence should be resolution specific, as well as being relevant, acceptable, and sufficient regarding the argument made. It should aim to support debaters claims and to persuade the audience to accept their position. The RJP allows judges to view all evidence through this lens and to provide effective feedback to the debaters regarding its use. Judges will identify if evidence was provided utilizing no explanation, if the evidence was case specific, then if the evidence used was adequate, and if the debaters utilized effective reasoning based on the evidence provided.

Finally, the RJP provides an opportunity for judges to discuss persuasive appeals with the debaters. *Ethos*, *pathos*, and *logos* are necessary for the persuasive opportunities within an audience; however, they are not always utilized effectively as seen in this study.<sup>43</sup> This use of Aristotle’s artistic appeals assist in the search for probable truth and engages the audience in the discovery with the presenter. The audience will assess the debaters character (*ethos*), which is

---

<sup>42</sup> See chapter 1 page 14.

<sup>43</sup> See chapter 2.

understood by based their sharp mindedness or intelligence, good character, and goodwill (Rhetoric 1.2.1). The debater can use *pathos* to convince the audience by using their ability to analyse critically the emotional disposition of the audience. Finally, debaters should be able to use reasoning, *en auto to logo*, within their speeches by creating sound arguments, thus proving relative truth to their audience. Judges may utilize the RJP to recognize if debaters use audience analysis in their appeals, if they are aware during the round of the persuasiveness of arguments based on the audience, if they have the correct use and amount of appeals, and if the debaters showed exceptional use of appeals to develop a compelling case.

Since the RJP not only reinforces each of the rhetorical canon, it also provides judges opportunity to help the debaters grow in rhetorical practice. Additionally, as debaters strive for winning (gamesmanship), they use the necessary principles of critical decision making. This shift makes education the primary goal within intercollegiate debate, without removing the competitive aspects. In simplest terms, judges have a constant paradigm, debaters focus on that paradigm to win, and the paradigm becomes a pedagogical tool to drive increased critical thought through effective rhetorical practice.

## CHAPTER 4

### APPLICATION OF THE RHETORICAL JUDGING PARADIGM

Intercollegiate debate has transformative academic capabilities for those students who participate. Fundamental to these capabilities are the development of critical decision-making skills, advanced or improved communication skills, and mastery of argumentation in both practice and theory (McGee & McGee, 2000). Judges and coaches influence how much of this educational benefit their students acquire, through their approach to coaching and their investment in judging tournament competition. In justification of funding support of extra-curricular debate activities, higher education has acknowledged the academic benefits for students, as they can emerge from their debate experience as advanced critical thinkers with greater potential for success after graduation (D'Souza, 2013). However, Alan Cirlin (2007) argues that these benefits are diminished when educational goals take a backseat to competition. Certainly, this study has found grounds to agree with Cirlin's position.

Unfortunately, the competitive nature of debate, not its educational potential, is what is consistently reinforced through the feedback of judges, who for practical reasons are traditionally focused primarily on winning (McGee, 1993). This judging focus on the competitive performances of debaters, not on the soundness of their reasoning or the effectiveness of their arguments, has been discussed in chapters 1 and 2, and an alternative judging paradigm has been provided in chapter 3. The aim of this chapter is to demonstrate the specific feedback that this alternative, the rhetorical judging paradigm (RJP), could provide by applying it at the debate

level to the 2014 final CEDA round. This application reveals how a focus on academic standards would have produced different feedback for the participants. Importantly, because both teams invoked matching theoretical and presentation paradigms, the actual results of the round probably would not have changed.<sup>44</sup>

Rashid Campbell and George Lee from the University of Oklahoma and Ameena Ruffin and Korey Johnson from Towson University performed effectively under the standards set by CEDA debate. Furthermore, they followed the paradigms set within the round.<sup>45</sup> Instead of analyzing their individual performances here, I have applied the RJP to analyze the debate round itself, to show how the RJP would be properly used and what different feedback it would generate. Both teams are included in the analysis and have the lens of the RJP applied to their debates and presentations. The resulting discussion provides a better understanding of how prioritizing academic goals over mere competition could benefit students.

Central to debate competition is the actual resolution being argued by the teams within the round. The topic for the CEDA final round had been provided months prior, and every team in the tournament had ample research and argument construction opportunities. The expectation of each team in the field was to debate the resolution, either in policy, fact, or value perspective. Again, the resolution was as follows:

**RESOLVED:** The United States Federal Government should substantially increase statutory and/or judicial restrictions on the war powers authority of the President of the United States in one or more of the following areas: targeted killing; indefinite detention; offensive cyber operations; or introducing United States Armed Forces into hostilities.

---

<sup>44</sup> My purpose herein is not to demean, attack, or disqualify the abilities of the CEDA debaters, but rather to show that an academic judging paradigm would have provided different feedback and, ultimately, could function to reshape how intercollegiate debate is being performed.

<sup>45</sup> See APPENDIX C, Judging paradigms, for detailed paradigms.

The inclusion of “should” within the resolution would traditionally stress a policy resolution or case. Teams could reasonably expect to discuss aspects of policy passed in Congress, the economics, hegemony, benefits and disadvantages, or any number of policy issues associated with the topic. Further, affirming or negating the resolution presented gives opportunity for clash of ideas between the teams. This process, then, provides equal ground to both teams, in so much as they have prepared arguments and research to discuss the topic area.

#### Application of the RJP to the Affirmation Case of Oklahoma

Oklahoma began the round by ignoring the resolution and, instead of discussing how the U.S.F.G. should restrict the war powers of the President, determined that they would debate “nigga authenticity” and the war on blacks by the government. They started their first speech with sub point A. Interpretation, and then offered a performance of slam poetry in support. They followed the performance with sub point B. Violation, which again was supported by a slam poetry performance. These points led to the establishment of their case, centered on government oppression due to lack of representation in and of the black community. Every subsequent argument formed by the Oklahoma team in the round addressed this self-imposed resolution.

In building their affirmative case, the Oklahoma team used logical and ethical appeals, but the dominant appeal of their case resided in *pathos*. Their use of emotion was designed to tug at the heart strings of the judges, to help the judges share the pain of the black community, and to offer an alternative narrative that would remove marginalization and otherization. The following is shown in the following statement:

Uh, says that the the the way status co works is through, uh, whiteness allowing, uh, forcing other bodies to tell, uh, nearations of whiteness in, uh, the violences that whiteness does me, uh, say that that is the link that we will go for!

The clear focus is shown on “the violences whiteness does me” and expresses a painful emotion, thus supporting *pathos*. While Oklahoma raised important social issues, involving racism and hegemony, which hold strong ethical appeal, these issues did not relate to the resolution. In terms of logical appeal, the Oklahoma team relied upon performance -- rap and slam poetry – and source material to support the idea of “nigga” and the subsequent oppression of the government. Perhaps, if the occasion had been one calling for performance art, not debate, this strategy would have been successful. But, the goal of the debate was to hold an argumentative clash on the resolution. Since the final decision in the round was 7-4 for the opposing team, we can conclude that for seven of the eleven judges, the Oklahoma team failed to establish the logical superiority of their affirmative case.

We find more evidence to explain this failure by considering the rhetorical frame they used for their case. Rather than developing a forensic or deliberative frame for their case, the Oklahoma affirmative team seemed to work from an epideictic one. Again, ignoring the resolution, which would have provided ample grounds for judging past facts about the government or for assessing future ramifications, they chose to focus on blaming the federal government for the state of African Americans. They purported the following: “War powers should not be waged against niggas.” This phrase “war powers,” levied by the United States, had a specific intent of being used “against niggas.” This approach was a clear negation of the resolution and moved the round out of an external paradigm model, squarely into an internal model.

The resolution in the round de facto called for a debate on presidential war powers, not the social state of African Americans. Consequently, the logical framework for arguing the resolution should have been one of policy deliberation, to examine specific current and past

instances of presidential war powers for the purpose of predicting the positive or negative effects of policy changes or future action on society. The resolution identified several areas for possible discussion including targeted killing, prisoner of war detention, cyber warfare, and the impact of troops being sent to war. Yet, the affirmative team chose to present a case which fell outside the grounds of the resolution.

Nonetheless, a policy case would have provided opportunity for Oklahoma to address problems within the black community in multiple instances. They could have chosen to discuss the hegemony of the USFG over a specific population when waging war. Instead, they relied upon an epideictic frame to blame problems within the black communities on the government.<sup>46</sup> The use of epideictic framing by the affirmative team does not necessarily show an understanding of rhetorical devices, as seen by the lack of proper application. The failure to apply such devices appropriately negates any positive effect they might have on the team's argumentation. An effective judging paradigm would have been able to correct these problems, instead of rewarding them.

Also within the round, Oklahoma failed to apply effective inventional skills, specific to the resolution presented. While they had over eight months to research the topic and to identify relevant facts, issues, or lines of reasoning for use in the round, they did not compose, develop, or present effective arguments regarding presidential powers or their restrictions. They made a conscious decision not to debate the resolution and embraced the internal judging paradigms established by most judges within the round. Nonetheless, the ability to invent arguments from facts and ideas relevant to the resolution is key to an effective debate, which aims to foster a direct clash between the affirmative and negative teams.

---

<sup>46</sup> See APPENDIX C Judging Paradigms for further information. Specifically, Deven Cooper maintains "Race/ Identity arguments: LOVE these especially from the black perspective."

Oklahoma failed through their series of arguments to affirm the resolution, which falls under the scope of the affirmative team, nor did they develop proofs to defend the case. This lack of evidentiary support is clearly seen, thus relevant ideas, circumstances, regulations, or points of contention are never provided. The affirmative team failed to embrace the resolution to urge the judges to vote for it. They never offered a narrative or argument to support the resolution, nor did they recognize the need to persuade the audience regarding the resolution. However, because Oklahoma never made arguments to the resolution and chose to focus on establishing a voice for individual discourse, they did not allow the negative team to engage, or clash, with their case. In short, the affirmative team failed to meet their responsibility within the round -- to develop appropriate arguments to clash with the negative. This failure would have been grounds for the decision to go against them.

In applying the RJP, judges would also question the competitors' skill at arranging the presentation of their cases.<sup>47</sup> Arrangement focuses on the order, sequence, and parts of the presentation, and should have worked to establish the arguments correctly. Judges would then be able to coach and to provide effective feedback to the debaters based on the arrangement of their cases and to show how they are strengthened or weakened based on how they were arranged. For example, "what does sub-point A have to do with the resolution?" or "Why is it first, rather than sub-point B?" This specific coaching allows for more effective critical thinking and better argument construction as well. Because of these failures, they are unable to move to an instance of conclusion, which should be asking for the judges to affirm the resolution.

Oklahoma also had specific problems with language. Traditional rhetoric maintains that effective linguistic style should be pure or correct, clear, appropriate, and ordinary, not technical

---

<sup>47</sup> By this, I mean, judges would question not only how specific arguments were chosen, but also how they were organized to be cogent and persuasive within the round.

(Cicero, *De inventione*). The language used in their presentation did not maintain grammatical correctness, clarity, or appropriateness. The multiple use of “nigga’s” within the round would be deemed inappropriate and unacceptable in most occasions. Additionally, their case was built around slang terms, slam poetry, and singing.<sup>48</sup> These performance-based aspects of their presentation worked to provide a voice for their position, but the case itself fell outside the scope of the resolution and thus the voice was inappropriate for the debate that should have occurred. Furthermore, they lacked clarity. The scope of debate is restricted and focused to facilitate the ability of the two teams to clash specifically over the resolution and to argue their points logically. As an activity, debate aims to be a process of inquiry and decision-making, requiring some common ground between opposing sides. It is not performance art that gives occasion for expressing individual voices.

Regarding the use of memory, Oklahoma demonstrated one aspect of it well. Through the recitation of both poetry and song lyrics, they showed they had memorized their presentation. They were successful at presenting their case without memory gaps, primarily due to the use of rote memory, yet they were able to correlate their case arguments to the negative team’s case. True rebuttal, however, and effective debate responses, exceeds standard rote memorization and embraces actual dialogue with the opposition. But, since the organizational structure of their argument failed to address the resolution, they were not able to improvise or refute adequately arguments that were raised in the course of the debate.

Matters of delivery can be vitally important in the success of a debate because they influence how well the arguments are accessed or received by the hearers. Within the RJP, judges are asked to look at delivery in terms of vocal factors, such as rate, pitch, and emphasis,

---

<sup>48</sup> See chapter 2 page 19 when they rap Tupac Shakur’s “Keep Your Head Up.”

as well as non-verbal factors, such as facial expression, hand gestures, and body movement. In this regard, the Oklahoma team designed the delivery of their case to cultivate emotional appeals (*pathos*).<sup>49</sup> If they had been giving an independent performance, such an approach would have seemed to be effective, but they were engaged in debate competition, an academic foray with an opposing team. As such, the delivery manner of the Oklahoma worked to alienate the opposing team from the field of argument in a tactical maneuver to try to garner the win on the judge's ballots.

On this point, the team's gamesmanship is clearly revealed. When they were reading evidence, the delivery of the Oklahoma team was muddled with error, due to the speed they used. Their goal was not to build support for a claim with evidence, or to help clarify a thought, but instead, to spread the case so far that the opposing team could not respond effectively to its scope. Not only is speed problematic for comprehending the meaning of what is being said, it also causes multiple related speech problems, such as reduced enunciation, increased stuttering, and heightened pitch. In general conversation, speed serves as a cue to hearers that what follows is not important, and in a debate round, it forces those listening to do the work of catching the evidence being rifled at them. If this tactic were only being used to present well known evidence in support of an argument, it might be less of an issue, but it is used to force the negative into a line by line analysis, after which the affirmative can maintain their arguments were never properly addressed.

Evidence within the final CEDA round was problematic from the onset because an internal paradigm was established. This paradigm gave Oklahoma the license to talk about whatever they wanted and in any context, they chose. Nonetheless, the evidence they offered in

---

<sup>49</sup> A See chapter 2 page 1 when they state, "Aunt Jemima and Uncle Ben be hid'n in the corner and shoot'n kids."

the performative aspect built emotional appeal and failed to address the resolution provided by CEDA. As previously noted, evidence was also used as a tool for spreading, not to enhance the clarity or the strength of affirmative arguments. In this regard, Oklahoma failed to provide evidence that affirmed the resolution within the round, thus failing to uphold the resolution, which was their primary responsibility within the round. The shortcomings of the affirmative case should have made it impossible for them to earn a win on the judging ballots, yet because of judging paradigms that allowed for internal models, Oklahoma was able to attain the support of four judges in the round.

The last criterion for assessing the merits of a team's presentation in the RJP is persuasive. The Oklahoma team was appealing in their presentation, entertaining even, yet they failed to present any level of argument to address the resolution. As such, they failed to be persuasive in affirming the resolution. They failed to apply any level of inductive or deductive reasoning to the case, and therefore gave no access to reason in support of their position within the round. Neither did they embrace evidence, build effective argument, or organize any ideas around the resolution. While they incorporated emotional appeal throughout the round, they failed to create any specific correlation of those appeals to the topic. As a result, the Oklahoma team did not establish any grounds for effective persuasion within the round.

With the rhetorical judging paradigm (RJP) as the judging instrument for the debate, we would see the following assessment of the Oklahoma team's presentation.

Appeals	Ethos	Logos	<b><u>Pathos</u></b>	
Argument Frame	Forensic	Deliberative	<b><u>Epidictic</u></b>	
Invention	<b><u>1</u></b>	2	3	4
Arrangement	<b><u>1</u></b>	2	3	4
Style	<b><u>1</u></b>	2	3	4
Memory	<b><u>1</u></b>	2	3	4
Delivery	<b><u>1</u></b>	2	3	4
Evidence	<b><u>1</u></b>	2	3	4
Persuasion	<b><u>1</u></b>	2	3	4

This assessment is not a wholesale indictment of the Oklahoma team, but it does reveal that fundamental rhetorical principles were not incorporated within their presentation. Use of the RJP would have been an effective tool for providing them with feedback for improvement. In this instance, the team members for Oklahoma could then have been coached that they used the wrong argument frame, inappropriate audience appeals, poor argument construction, substandard presentation, ineffective use of evidence, and ineffective persuasive techniques within their case and presentation.

Though initially this feedback may not have been accepted as grounds for losing, ultimately, as the drive to win increases, teams who want the competitive edge would view such input as reinforcement for better presentational choices, especially if judges were to use it consistently in tournament competition. The feedback shown above, easily accessible with the use of the RJP, embraces rhetorical tradition over gamesmanship, yet does not eliminate the competitive aspects of debate. The result helps maintain the importance of placing academics and learning above winning.

#### Application of the RJP to the Negative Case of Towson

The negative team from Towson University began the round much in the same fashion as the affirmative Oklahoma team, by failing to address the resolution. Individuals with an internal

paradigm of judging would maintain the negative team does not have to remain topical, yet Aristotelian concepts of argumentation would maintain that they should seek the truth regarding the resolution and then construct arguments accordingly. Towson began by developing concepts of white privilege to discuss the otherization of African Americans, and utilize aspects of queerness to access the “nigga’s” throughout their speeches. Towson espoused the following:

Uh, man’s sole jabringing object disfigure religion trauma and nubs, uh, the, inside the trauma of representation that turns into the black child devouring and identifying with the stories and into the white culture brought up, uh, de de de de de, dink, and add subjectively like a white man, the black man!

Towson worked to show how the *status quo* is a traumatic attack on “the black child,” utilizing “the stories and into the white culture.” They extended this idea of black culture to the “nigga” and made attempted application of queer theory to that term. They continue with the following:

Uh, says that the the the way status co works is through, uh, whiteness allowing, uh, forcing other bodies to tell, uh, nearations of whiteness in, uh, the violences that whiteness does me, uh, say that that is the link that we will go for!

At no point did they attempt to find the truth within the resolution, as noted prior, but instead attempted to apply communication theory to a scenario they created within the round. In multiple aspects, they made the same arguments that were presented by the affirmative team, and the only clash that occurred was technical at best. Throughout their speeches, they delved into spreading and speed to reinforce this stance.

Towson quickly focused on the use of *pathos* as their primary appeal. They painted a picture of an abusive, elitist, white privileged government that otherized the “nigga”. They conceptualized this plight through evidence and narrative, to create an emotional appeal to the audience. The use of abuse of black children sought to create sympathy, while the use of lyrics from Tupac’s “Keep your head up” showed government subsidy programs were designed to enslave the black community. Their intent was to invoke both sympathy and anger. While

evidence was offered, their focus was not on logical appeals or reasoning, but rather on making ethical appeals. The use of emotional appeals potentially was accessible in the round; however, with a focus on otherization and queer, establishing both *logos* and *ethos* initially would have been more beneficial to the arguments they made. Towson struggled in their construction to be focused on one specific goal, as such they relied on *pathos* (emotions) and *ethos* (credibility) and unwittingly switched back and forth. However, neither of the appeals was used in a manner that addressed the resolution. Towson could easily have incorporated logical appeal, within an external paradigm model, to challenge Oklahoma on the lack of affirmation of the resolution. They could have established *ethos* by displaying a solid understanding of the theory they were using and of argumentation, but, as Oklahoma did, they also decided to play debate and to negate the scope of the round entirely.

While the subject matter discussed has strong critical and research implications, it was not the topic provided by CEDA in July of 2013. After eight months of preparation, Towson found a way not to debate the topic provided. Education failed to be the primary driver within the round. Instead, they resorted to gamesmanship and used an emotional appeal to sway judges to their viewpoint. This tactic was successful on their part because the judges voted 7-4 for their case and awarded them the National Championship. Yet this use of appeals was completely mishandled and the judging paradigms presented failed to identify or correct the issue. The rhetorical judging paradigm offered could accomplish both.

Regarding the argument frame, Towson employed the use of epideictic, as did Oklahoma, which provided them opportunity to blame the United States government. They argued that the government was culpable because it was established in white privilege and systematically otherized those outside of the elite establishment. They employed key aspects of epideictic

because they noted they were a part of the community and as such were part of the otherization. The evidence presented was directed completely at this name and blame scenario. Again, the goal of this round was to discuss the government's restriction of presidential war powers. The negative team could readily have addressed hegemony, elitism, and economical otherization of foreign countries by unchecked presidential power. Choosing to do so would have allowed them access to the deliberative occasion and the opportunity to discuss future social impacts. These impacts could have linked back to internal white privilege aspects within our government and how unchecked presidential war powers extend the same systemic racial problems into other nations. However, they failed to do the work to present this type of case. Instead, they chose to forgo debating the resolution entirely and to embrace a *pathos* appeal with an epideictic occasion. Clearly, this was the wrong approach and use of a *logos* appeal with a deliberative occasion would have been more appropriate. It also would have given them access to the resolution, provided clash with the affirmative team, proven effective understanding of debate theory, and supported educational goals in the round. Through their failure in this aspect, performance and gamesmanship were embraced.

The Towson team struggled within every aspect of the use of the theoretical canon, primarily because they never addressed the resolution within the round. If they had embraced an external paradigm, their focus would have been on disproving the resolution or negating the affirmative case. Instead, they embraced an internal paradigm, and all of their argumentation aimed to prove that case. This choice was not an off-case argument but rather the use of *kritik*; the resolution itself was never discussed, and argumentation about it was never formalized.

Invention through idea development, proof, or through the discovery of presidential war powers never occurred. Towson had extensive research time to understand the scope and

logistics of presidential authority, its benefits, and the necessity to reject limitation of the current structure. Further, opportunity to include the use of prior historical evidence for verification could have been done also. Granted, the negative team did build arguments and use invention for their positions; however, this was done outside of the scope of the round. On its face, this approach should have been rejected and noted in the RFD. The rhetorical judging paradigm embraces Cicero's idea that arguments should be true and supported (Condor et al., 2013). While the negative's views on white privilege, governmental oppression, and otherization may have had argumentative merit in other conversations, they lacked invention regarding the designated topic completely.

In a practical sense, the canon of arrangement should provide the negative team an opportunity to discuss the resolution and to negate it. The positioning of their arguments should have been designed in such a manner as to move persuasively from understanding to the judging decisions. The structure should have been informative and led to revelation, insight, or discussion of alternatives; instead, they constructed a performance that embraced technical debate, spreading, and focused on a presentation designed to win. Since the resolution called for presidential limitations in these areas, "Targeted killing; indefinite detention; offensive cyber operations; or introducing United States Armed Forces into hostilities," Towson could easily have constructed arguments regarding the benefits of utilizing drone strikes to prevent civilian death, how refusing indefinite detention in Guantanamo led to more terrorist campaigns, or how the use of cyber operations could potential impact the missile launch capabilities of North Korea. Choice and arrangement of this type of argument would have debated the resolution and given them ample ground to win the debate.

As noted, linguistic style, when viewed through a traditional research lens, should be pure or correct, clear, ordinary and appropriate language (Cicero, 1942). Towson failed at a high level in this regard. The lack of proper grammar and grammatical style was apparent throughout the round. Beyond the stuttering, clamoring, and unintelligible sounds, improper use of words, incorrect contextual application, and lack of clarity were also evident. Improper theoretical explanation, or Delphic theory application, occurred throughout their speeches. Misapplication of queer theory was apparent, as was its application when Towson attempted to use it for the technical case turn aspect. This lack of appropriateness is due to the fact the negative team's arguments did not fit the given situation, which resolutionally dealt with war power and presidential limitations. So, their arguments were neither clear or correct. Their style did relate to their subject matter and performance style, but again those were all clearly outside the scope of the round.

The concept of memory was non-existent for the negative team in the round. They made no attempt to perform anything other than rote memorization throughout. When making counter arguments to the affirmative, they simply referred to their prescribed rote responses. While their case was organized in an epideictic manner, it failed to reach even an effective performative level. Each speaker continuously fumbled with her notes, mispronounced words, and lacked the ability for recall of specific points of evidence. Additionally, the data they did recall was seldom used as counter points but instead was used technically to show links of the affirmative case to their kritik. As with the Oklahoma team, Towson failed to make a concise argument toward the topic, and their argument preparation failed to provide recall opportunity to extend points or truth.

Delivery proved to be problematic for both teams within the round, but Towson especially failed to be effective. Speed was used to take advantage of spreading and line by line analysis. While the tactic is problematic in its own right, the general level of delivery used by the Towson team on occasion was atrocious. Mumbling, word misappropriation, failure to enunciate, and enormous gulps of air left hearers searching for the point being made. When evidence was read, the speaker failed even to speak at a level that allowed words to be heard by the audience. Gestures were equally ineffective and failed to support the point, to call the audience's attention, or to achieve any level of persuasion. The failure of the negative to use correct vocals and nonverbal cues created a negative impact on their case. Anyone listening to them, outside of the CEDA debate community, would have been appalled.<sup>50</sup> As noted previously, even those within the academic debate became unhinged at the performance, which is why the CEDA president had to make a formal statement to address it (APPENDIX B). Towson won the tournament on a 7-4 decision, though they lacked any level of real-world delivery, skill, or competence. The technical debate performance, relying upon speed and bellowed breathing, should be rejected.

As shown in the application of the rhetorical judging paradigm (RJP) in the appeals, argument frames, and rhetorical canon, the negative team also struggled with evidence. Primarily, they failed to build any arguments pertaining to the resolution, and as such their evidence failed to be effective in their case construction. Evidence provided in the round was designed in a manner to support the kritik, to spread the affirmative out of the round, and to

---

<sup>50</sup> See the online feedback found at 2014 CEDA final round judging results, retrieved from [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YqcX\\_tpQu3U](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YqcX_tpQu3U); "I thought that the idea of debate was to present evidence and opinion in a rational and reasoned argument to persuade an audience that your position has greater merit than that of your opponents. It involves presenting a case, rebutting the opposing case, and responding to questions from the audience. It is a serious, cogitative, intellectual exercise requiring the communication of ideas to others, and responsive counter-arguing against opposing ideas. This CEDA nonsense is a travesty" and "Debate? More like incoherent babble", "IS this garbage what we call debating now? If so, please someone stop earth so my alien family can pick me up, I want off!" and "Why do you think the shit in this video has been given legitimacy? Hint: comments like yours making it easy to dismiss valid criticism."

exploit emotional appeal. While each of those strategies could have been implemented within the round, when addressing the resolution, Towson failed to implement any of them. CEDA released the resolution in early July 2013. This timeframe allowed debate programs an opportunity to research the topic, provide definitional clarity, review current literature, challenge theory, and find Aristotelian truths even before starting the construction of their cases. The case presented by the negative team lacked any such attempt and can clearly be seen as a way to use internal paradigms to garner a win, the ultimate form of gamesmanship.

Finally, in review of persuasive appeals, it should be readily identifiable that the negative team failed to build a solid theoretical case around the resolution. The wrong appeals were used, as was an ineffective argument frame. Ultimately, the negative team also failed to make effective use of the rhetorical canon in building their case as well. For these reasons, the Towson team was not persuasive, even though they were chosen as champions. Confusion and *pathos* were the dominant themes within the round, and they were intertwined with otherization and queer theory. Thus, when compared to the almost strictly performative aspects of the affirmative team, Towson seemed to be making stronger arguments. Regardless of how the judges within the round may have felt personally about otherization and queer theory, the concepts were never associated with the resolution and should not have been persuasive in voting against the resolution. Towson made arguments that the affirmative team, Oklahoma, had rejected the “nigga” as queer, but the Oklahoma team made essentially the same argument. As when Oklahoma team maintained:

They say the niggas always already queer, that’s exactly the point! It means the impact is that the that the is the impact term, uh, to the afraid, uh, the, that it is a case turn to the affirmative because, we, uh, we’re saying that queer bodies are not able to survive the necessarily means of the body.

Each team developed weak argumentation around queer theory, without effective application or extended understanding., which was easily recognizable by any of the judges who had an accurate understanding of the theory. For this reason, the persuasive impact of the case was minimal.

Nonetheless, the judges gave way to gamesmanship in their decision making and failed the teams by not providing a strong rhetorical critique. The Towson team did not provide persuasive argumentation under the rhetorical judging paradigm. With the RJP, the following assessment of their performance would have been provided.

Appeal	Ethos	Logos	<u>Pathos</u>	
Argument Frame	Forensic	Deliberative	<u>Epideictic</u>	
Invention	<u>1</u>	2	3	4
Arrangement	<u>1</u>	2	3	4
Style	<u>1</u>	2	3	4
Memory	<u>1</u>	2	3	4
Delivery	<u>1</u>	2	3	4
Evidence	<u>1</u>	2	3	4
Persuasion	<u>1</u>	2	3	4

Still, this critique is not an indictment of the Towson team, but rather it is simply a tool designed to coach debaters in argumentation and educational principles they should be applying as they debate. The negative team from Towson had the capability to be effective rhetors, but the internal judging paradigms to which they were exposed and by which they were trained, focused on competition over education. Again, I recognize the rigor of preparation Towson underwent in case preparation, and I am not claiming that they did not learn anything from the experience. However, the application of the rhetorical judging paradigm (RJP) clearly shows problematic areas that different preparation and emphasis could address and that would enhance their real-world application learning experiences.

The rhetorical judging paradigm (RJP) embraces an external model which is far more effective in guiding how debaters prepare for their rounds. Had Oklahoma and Towson been utilizing the proposed paradigm, they would have spent the year developing sound argumentation, correct theoretical constructs, and persuasive presentation. Instead, they aimed at aspects of competitiveness, due to shifting judging paradigms, that differed by round.

## CHAPTER 5

### CONCLUSIONS

Intercollegiate debate competition provides a unique academic space, which provides us the opportunity to teach students the application of the rhetorical canon and critical decision making skills. As research confirms, when practice with respect to these academic standards, debate activity promotes better understanding and application of theory, more advanced skill in argumentation processes, and keener critical thinking among students. Debaters should garner the necessary skills that allow for critical analysis and assessment, for argument construction, and for synthesis of ideas, as applied to the resolution provided within a round, because they need to be able to recognize problems as well as to make logical inferences and predict outcomes during the course of the debate.

However, as this study has discussed,<sup>51</sup> intercollegiate debate has lost sight of these educational goals. Students, motivated by the competitive nature of debate, grasp the tools that allow for winning, often in lieu addressing the merits of the actual resolution. Judges in acceptance of multiple, individualized, judging paradigms have fostered highly technical presentational forms that have become exclusionary to non-participants. For over six decades, scholars have argued that the technicality of college debate limits its educational benefits (Swinney, 1968). By the end of the 1970s, many scholars argued that debate was no longer viable for education, because it was inaccessible to those outside of the debate community. The technicality of debate competition has increased, so has the acceptance of jargon, speed, and line

---

<sup>51</sup> See Chapter 1, pgs. 1-7 and Chapter 2 case study.

by line analysis by participants and judges. McGee and McGee (2000) question whether intercollegiate debate holds any value beyond mere competition. Debaters are learning to develop cases that address the judging paradigms, not sound or effective argumentation skills (Padbury & Zhang, 2011). They learn to provide excessive amounts of evidence, to buffer spreading, and to improve their chances of winning, not their reasoning about the resolution. Cirlin (1997) claims in the debate that the focus on winning or losing, gamesmanship, has clearly surpassed education as the priority in debate. Others have suggested that the idea that debate is at all educational, rather than mere sport, is a myth (Guerin, et al., 1979).

As we come to ask why this technical nature has persisted, despite its criticism, we learn that a significant reason seems to be the established judging paradigms, revealed within RFD's, that have encouraged debaters to embrace techniques, not substance, to win rounds (Cirlin, 1998). Furthermore, those who are assuming these paradigms, individual debate judges themselves, were also debate participants who learned to embrace those same behaviors as practical. In this manner, the technical models for debate competition continue to be passed on to the next generation of debaters. Thus, judges have become the driving force behind debate (McGee & McGee, 2000). Judging paradigms are not only adapted but also become foundational truths for how intercollegiate debate should function. Yet, the research of D'Souza (2013) and others has shown that debate activity focused on winning, fails to achieve the academic educational goals assumed to result from such activity. Consequently, numerous institutions no longer allow participation in intercollegiate debate, but the cycle continues; as the number of participants has dwindled, the elitism of those remaining has increased (Shepard, 1973).

Use of these paradigms have transitioned intercollegiate debate into a game, more than an academic process, and the negative aspects are obvious.<sup>52</sup> Intercollegiate debate must embrace a shift to a judging paradigm that returns its participants to a locus of the intended rhetorical and argumentative outcomes on which it was founded. As noted by Colbert and Biggers (1985) an effective judging paradigm leads debaters to develop communication abilities, stronger research capabilities, and better analytical skills, in order to apply them in the real world. The RJP is offered as an exemplar of a new shared intercollegiate judging paradigms.

RJP is designed to use the rhetorical canon, as judging criteria, and when followed by judges, the RJP can serve to train debaters in behaviors that adhere to those principals. The RJP and its rubric can function to guides judges in aspects of invention, arrangement, style, memory, and delivery, as they pertain to debaters. In terms of intercollegiate debate competition, the RJP promotes and external paradigm that established principals from rhetorical theory. The RJP should allow judges to move away from technical debate, designed to focus only on winning, and to help them inform students of the processes necessary to advance critical thinking, as well as how to deal with the resolution provided within a debate round properly. For example, through invention, students uncover the purpose of the resolution and learn to construct effective arguments. The RJP can also assist judges in providing coaching that ensures debaters understand how to order their speech's in logical manner and to present their cases clearly. Judges using the RJP would have the means to recognize and reward debaters who demonstrated effective word choice, and audience awareness, as well as those who use their research and prior knowledge to support or to extend their arguments within a round. Perhaps most significantly, the RJP would emphasize to students and their coaches the importance of cultivating effective

---

<sup>52</sup> See the use of *The Glass Bead Game* as a rhetorical lens on pp. 69-72.

communication skills, including an audience-centered manner of delivery. The application of RJP could shift the tide regarding intercollegiate debate. If applied, to both debaters and judges, it could return the focus to education over mere gamesmanship in what some might consider an esoteric sport.

Certainly, the benefits of current intercollegiate debate should not be dismissed, yet many academics and scholars are doing just that because of the technical models followed by debaters. As this study has sought to show, what is problematic within the debate community is a lack of consistency in judging philosophies and growing endorsement of debate as a technical game. Judges bring their own experiences as former participants into the round, and their experiential philosophies thereby become more ingrained in the fabric of debate and are considered part of debate itself. Battles between internal and external paradigms rage, debate associations split, technical practices rather than good debates become manifest the new associations, and the frustrations are revisited. This cycle must be broken if intercollegiate debate is to remain educationally viable and accessible.

Judges are the drivers of the mentality within the debate community; debaters will seek to understand the individual judging philosophies to garner the win in the round. If judges provide feedback focused on internal paradigms, with no real-world application, inclusive of technicality and jargon, then participants will resort to those techniques to win. But, if judges relay feedback on effective rhetoric and make those skills the gateway to the win, the primary focus will become learning those skills instead of game techniques. The rhetorical judging paradigm (RJP) is a synthesis of traditional rhetorical principles from Aristotle, Cicero, and Richard Whately about the nature of effective argumentation. This synthesis of theory provides a judging framework that

is both academically sound and practical and could resolve the conflict between educational value and gamesmanship.

Adoption of the rhetorical judging paradigm (RJP) limits the need for individual judging paradigms. In the debate community, many argue that debaters benefit from adapting their style to multiple paradigms. While potential benefits may exist, the negative effects far outweigh them. Shifting judging philosophies have been proven to reinforce technical forms, embrace line by line sophistic analysis, while often rejecting addressing the resolution in the pursuit of the win (Padbury & Zhang, 2011). A review of literature and extant judging philosophies has shown this to be both true and problematic. The use of the 2014 CEDA final round as a case study provides extensive proof. The finalists from Oklahoma and Towson were focused on technical performative aspects of debate, embraced the fluidity of judging paradigms offered, and the result was nothing less than a complete argumentative failure. The case study mirrored the issues uncovered within the review of literature and reflected the noted identification of problems. It also revealed the necessity of a cohesive judging archetype.

The rhetorical judging paradigm (RPJ) synthesizes key theoretical perspectives, and when applied to the case study, the RJP reveals the negative aspects of gamesmanship, while providing grounds for more effective argumentative coaching and demonstrating how to reward the educational skills of participants over mere competition technique. The RJP would provide continuity within the debate arena by allowing the entire community to focus on debate as a rhetorical process. Judges could listen to arguments through the appropriate lens and then provide academic feedback to instruct the debaters more appropriately. Competition would not be lost, but without shifting standards, it could be fairer to a broader group of students.

Competition could then reward sound argumentation, effectively presented, not technical performance or gameplay.

### Limitations

The RJP provides an effective synthesis of theory and establishes a framework for debate competition. But, there are limitations to the research from which it was generated. Most notably, this study looks only at one specific case. As Stake (2005) warns us, case studies provide opportunity for a narrative landscape through the researcher's point of view that can create an opportunity for the researcher to pass personal bias to the reader through detailed constructs. Erickson (1986) also points out that case studies, since they uniquely focus on an individual instance, may not always be completely generalizable to other instances. These limitations were taken into consideration, and every effort was made to limit research bias through effective research and application. Uncovering the correlation between judging models and feedback to competitor gamesmanship, the presentation of a synthesized rhetorical judging paradigm, and subsequent application is all a portion of the solution. Since it would be impossible to attempt to apply the model to every debate round, the case study was deemed most appropriate for the study. Additionally, this study has laid a foundation for discussion, with a proposed paradigm, which future research efforts may investigate further.

### Recommendations

Intercollegiate debate competition has been practiced for more than two-hundred years as a tool for teaching aspects of argumentation and persuasion, as well as enhancing research and critical thinking (Hunt, 1994). Instead of rejecting debate, because of negative practices, institutions, scholars, and coaches should institute change to foster its beneficial potential. Part of that change could be to include the RJP (rhetorical judging paradigm) proposed in this study.

Further research should be extended beyond case studies and into application of RJP in intercollegiate debate. I recommend the following two research projects:

1. Establish a quantitative study that investigates two concurrent tournaments. One tournament would use the RJP, and the second would allow the use of existing judging paradigms.
  - a. The study would be designed to extend the case study format used in this study.
  - b. Compare the results of the tournaments to understand where better theoretical application occurred and where education usurped competition.
2. Partner with a specific debate association to use the RJP (rhetorical judging paradigm) throughout an entire debate season.
  - a. Train judges and debaters on the paradigm and tool prior to each tournament.
  - b. Establish a case study in the championship round.
  - c. Perform a comparative analysis of the case study done in this study and the case study of the proposed championship round case study.

Together, these two projects could provide a better understanding of the benefits possible with the application of the RPJ (rhetorical judging paradigm) and broaden that understanding in both method and scope.

Finally, intercollegiate debate offers great benefit when it maintains an educational and rhetorical focus. This study has shown a correlation between judging paradigms, which have become the cornerstone of debate tournaments, and participant behaviors. Within the realm of competition exists reward for mere gamesmanship, which embraces technicality, speed, and exclusive jargon. This study, through the proposed RJP, seeks to reinstitute educational value, rather than mere competition as the goal for intercollegiate debate. It is my hope that the

academy supports me in this endeavor and that the debate community embraces the paradigm as well.

## REFERENCES

- Agnew, L., Barrett, H., Caplan, H., Corbett, E.J., Enos, R., & James, M. (1997.) The classical tradition: Rhetoric and oratory. *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, Vol 27 (2), 7-38.
- American Debate Association Rules and Constitution (2017). *American Debate Association Rules and Constitution*. Retrieved from <http://www.cedadebate.org/forum/index.php?topoic=348>
- American Free Press. (2017). *America's top orators in action - CEDA 2014 finals: American free press: Free download & streaming: Internet archive*. Retrieved from <https://archive.org/details/DebateAmericanStyleOurTopOratorsInAction>.
- Andrew, D. (1996). Popular culture and public debate. *Historical Journal*, 39(2), 406.
- Anglin, A. (2014). College debate forums brought down to primitive levels by blacks. *Daily Stormer*. Retrieved from <http://www.dailystormer.com/college-debate-forums-brought-down-to-primitive-levels-by-blacks/>
- Anonymous. (1954). *Ad C. Herennium. De ratione dicendi (Rhetorica ad Herennium)*. (Trans. H. Caplan). Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.
- APDA (2017). *American Parliamentary Debate Association*. Retrieved from <http://apda.org/>
- Aristotle. (1991). *Aristotle on rhetoric: A theory of civic discourse*. (G. Kennedy, Trans.). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Aristotle. (1938). *The organon*. (H. Cooke, H. Tredennick, & E. Forster, Trans.). Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.
- Augustine (1995). *De doctrina Christiana*. Oxford early Christian texts. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Ball, S. J. (2013). *The education debate*. Bristol U.K.: Policy Press.
- Banks, M. (1985). *The inter-paradigm debate*. London: Frances Pinter, 7-26.
- Bauschard, S. (2014). *Debating kritiks*. Millennial Debate Institute. Retrieved from <http://millennialsd.com/2014/02/27/debating-kritiks/>.
- Bellon, J. (2000). A research-based justification for debate across the curriculum. *Argumentation and Advocacy*, 36(3), 161-75.

- Bradley, J. & Sutton, B. (1993). Reframing the paradigm debate. *The Library Quarterly Information, Community, Policy*, 63(4), 405-410.
- Brennan, D. (2006). Defining success: Examining what it means to be good in forensics. (Unpublished Master of Fine Arts thesis). Minnesota State University, Mankato, MN.
- Brummett, B. (2014). *Rhetoric in popular culture*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Burke, K. (1947). Ideology and myth. *Accent*, 7, 195-205.
- Burnett, A., Brand, J., & Meister, M. (2003). Winning is everything: Education as myth in forensics. *The National Forensic Journal*, 21(1), 12-23.
- Cates, C., & Eaves, M. (2010). Back to the future in forensics: CEDA vs. Parliamentary debate. *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta*, 95, 21-27.
- CEDA Nats Indiana (2014). *2014 CEDA final round judging results*. Retrieved from [https://www.tabroom.com/index/tourn/results/event\\_results.mhtml?tourn\\_id=2011&result\\_id=4694](https://www.tabroom.com/index/tourn/results/event_results.mhtml?tourn_id=2011&result_id=4694).
- CEDA (2014). *2014 CEDA 4 Announcement*. YouTube. Retrieved from [http://youtu.be/0Pij5Sg4\\_DY](http://youtu.be/0Pij5Sg4_DY).
- CEDA (2017). *Cross examination debate association*. Retrieved from <http://cedadebate.org/>.
- CEDA (2017). *CEDA research publications 2014*. Retrieved from <http://www.ceda.com.au/publications/research-publications/2014>.
- Chall, J. S. (1983). *Learning to read: The great debate*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Chomsky, N. (2013). *The common good*. Monroe, ME: Odonian Press.
- Chomsky, N., Barsamian, D., & Naiman, A. (1998). *The common good*. Monroe, ME: Odonian Press.
- Cicero, M. (1942). *Cicero: De oratore*. (E. Sutton & H. Rackham Trans.). Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.
- Cirlin, A. (1997). A sociological approach to improving style in academic debate. *Southern Journal of Forensics*, 2, 262-266.
- Cirlin, A. (1998). A public debate manifesto. *Southern Journal of Forensics*, 2, 339-350.
- Cirlin, A. (2007). Academic debate v. advocacy in the real-world: A comparative analysis. *Journal of the International Public Debate Association*, 1(1), 3-18.

- Cohen, A. I. & Wellman, C. H. (Eds.). (2014). *Contemporary debates in applied ethics*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Colbert, K. and Biggers, T. (1985). Why should we support debate? *Journal of the American Forensic Association* 21, 237-40.
- Cole, T. (1991). *The origins of rhetoric in ancient Greece*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Condor, S., Tileaga, C., & Billig, M. (2013). *Political rhetoric*. Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press.
- Cooper, B. (2017). "I was hurt": How white elite racism invaded a college debate championship. *Salon*. Retrieved from [http://www.salon.com/2014/05/13/%E2%80%9Ci\\_was\\_hurt%E2%80%9D\\_how\\_white\\_elite\\_racism\\_invaded\\_a\\_college\\_debate\\_championship/](http://www.salon.com/2014/05/13/%E2%80%9Ci_was_hurt%E2%80%9D_how_white_elite_racism_invaded_a_college_debate_championship/).
- Cox, J. R. (1974). A study of judging philosophies of the participants of the national debate tournament. *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, 11, 61-71.
- Crick, N. (2013). *Rhetorical public speaking*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Darby, M. (2007). Debate: A teaching-learning strategy for developing competence in communication and critical thinking. *Journal of Dental Hygiene*. 81(4), 1-10.
- Dalton, W. & Pross, E. L. (1954). The successful intercollegiate debater. *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta*, 40(1), 3-4.
- Davis, K. A., Zorwick, M. L. W., Roland, J., & Wade, M. M. (Eds.). (2016). *Using Debate in the classroom: Encouraging critical thinking, communication, and collaboration*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Delaney, J. T. & Huselid, M. A. (1996). The impact of human resource management practices on perceptions of organizational performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39(4), 949-969.
- Dolan, F. E. (1993). *Taking the pencil out of God's hand: Art, nature, and the face-painting debate in early modern England*. New York, NY: Modern Language Association of America, 224-239.
- Dreher, R. (2014). *How to speak gibberish & win a national debate title*. Retrieved from <http://www.theamericanconservative.com/dreher/how-to-speak-gibberish-win-a-national-debate-title/>.

- D'Souza, C. (2013). *Debating: A catalyst to enhance learning skills and competencies*. Education Training, 55(6), 538-549. doi:10.1108/et-10-2011-0097.
- Einhorn, L. (1981). Consistency in Richard Whately: The scope of his rhetoric. *Philosophy & Rhetoric*, Vol. 14 (2), 89-99.
- Elliot, L. (1993). Using debates to teach the psychology of women. *Teaching Psychology*, 20(1): 35-38.
- English, E. (1995). Reading and wisdom: *The de doctrina christiana of augustine in the middle ages* (Notre dame conferences in medieval studies, no. 6). Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Enos, R.L. (1985). Ciceronian dispositio as an architecture for creativity in composition: A note for the affirmative. *Rhetoric Review*, Vol 4 (1), 108-110.
- Erickson, F. (1986). Qualitative methods in research on teaching. In M.C. Whittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Teaching*. 3rd ed. 119-161. Old Tappan, NJ: Macmillan.
- Flyvbjerg, B. (2008). Five misunderstandings about case-study research. *Sage Journals*, 12(2), 219-245.
- Ford, A. (2002). *The origins of criticism: Literary culture and poetic theory in classical Greece*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Foss, S.K., Foss, K.A., Trapp, R. (1991). *Contemporary perspectives on rhetoric*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.
- Foss, S. (2009). *Rhetorical criticism: Exploration & practice*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.
- Freeley, A. J., & Steinberg, D. L. (2013). *Argumentation and debate*. Boston, MA: Cengage Learning.
- Freshwater, D., & Cahill, J. (2013). Paradigms lost and paradigms regained. *Sage Journals*, 1(1), 48-76.
- Gaer, D. (2002). Formulaic forensics: When competitive success stifles creativity. *The National Forensic Journal*, 20(1), 54-56.
- Geradin, D., & McCahery, J. A. (2005). *Regulatory co-opetition: transcending the regulatory competition debate*. Amsterdam Center for Law & Economics Working Paper, (2005-06).
- Gilbert, R. (2006). Looking for Mr. Schumpeter: Where are we in the competition-innovation debate? In *Innovation Policy and the Economy*, Volume 6 (pp. 159-215). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

- Golden, J.L., Berquist, G.F., Coleman, W.E. (1983). *The rhetoric of western thought*. 3rd ed. Dubuque: Kendall/Hunt.
- Goring, P. (2006). *The rhetoric of sensibility in eighteenth-century culture*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.
- Griffin, E. (2006.) *A first look at communication theory*. McGraw Hill, New York.
- Guerin, W. L., Labor, E., Morgan, L., Reesman, J. C., & Willingham, J. R. (2005). *A handbook of critical approaches to literature*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Haapala, T. (2016). Procedure and debate in the British parliamentary culture. In *Political rhetoric in the Oxford and Cambridge unions, 1830–1870*. 57-101. New York, NY: Springer International Publishing.
- Havelock, E.A. (1986). *The muse learns to write: Reflections on orality and literacy from antiquity to the present*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Havelock, E.A. (2005). *Preface to Plato: History of the Greek mind*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press.
- Heath, M. (1994). The substructure of stasis-theory from Hermagoras to Hermogenes. *The Classical Quarterly*, 44(1), 114-129.
- Hellmann, G. (2003). In conclusion: dialogue and synthesis in individual scholarship and collective inquiry. *International Studies. Rev.* 5, 147-150.
- Herrick, J. (2005). *A history and theory of rhetoric: An introduction*. 3rd edition. New York: Allyn and Bacon.
- Hesse, H. (1943). *The glass bead game (Magister Ludi)* (First edition.). Owl Books. 352 - 354. ISBN 0-8050-1246-X.
- Hill, B., & Leeman, R. W. (1996). *The art and practice of argumentation and debate*. New York, NY: McGraw Hill Humanities, Social Sciences & World Languages.
- Hill, B: (1993). The value of competitive debate as a vehicle for promoting the development of critical thinking ability. In A. Gill (Ed.), *CEDA Yearbook 14*, 1-22. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company.
- Hoffman, M. (1989). Critical theory and the inter-paradigm debate. In *the Study of International Relations* (pp. 60-86). Basingstoke, U.K.: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Homar, K. S. (2014). *Prose declaimers: British romantic essayists and classical rhetoric* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh).

- Honeycutt, L. (2004). *Aristotle's rhetoric*, Public Homepage Web Server. Retrieved January 12, 2010, from the website temoa: Open Educational Resources (OER) Portal at <http://www.temoa.info/node/39022>.
- Hunt, S. (1994). The values of forensic participation. In T. Winebrenner (Ed.), *Intercollegiate Forensics*. 1-19. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Co.
- IPDA. (2017). *International Parliamentary Debate Association*. Retrieved from <http://ipda.org/>.
- Inoue, N., & Nakano, M. (2004, June). The benefits and costs of participating in competitive debate activities: Differences between Japanese and American college students. In *Wake Forest University/International society for the study of argumentation*, Venice argumentation conference, June 2004. 27-30.
- Johnson, R. (1959). Isocrates' methods of teaching. *The American Journal of Philology*, 80, 25-36.
- Keith, W. M. (2007). *Democracy as a discussion: Civic education and the American forum movement*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
- Kennedy, G. (1980). *Classical rhetoric and its Christian and secular tradition from ancient to modern times*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Kennedy, G. A. (2015). *History of rhetoric, volume I: The art of persuasion in Greece* (Vol. 1). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Kent, A. A. (2007). *African, native, and Jewish American literature and the reshaping of modernism*. New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Kimball, B.A. (1986). *Orators and philosophers: A history of the ideal liberal education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Koschmann, T. D. (1996). *CSCL, theory and practice of an emerging paradigm*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Kraft, J. (2017). *Hacking traditional college debate's white-privilege problem*. Retrieved from <https://www.theatlantic.com/education/archive/2014/04/traditional-college-debate-white-privilege/360746/>.
- Kuhn, T. (1962). *The structure of scientific revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kuster, T., Olson, L., & Loging, J. (2000). Reaching out to the wider community by enlisting non-professional judges in parliamentary debate. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Communication Association, Seattle.

- Kuster, T. (2007). A proposal to use public judges in deep out rounds at NPDA. *Speaker Points from Phi Rho Pi*, 11(1), 1-8. Retrieved from [www.phirhopi.org/phi-rho-pi/spts/spkrpts11.1/publicjudges.html](http://www.phirhopi.org/phi-rho-pi/spts/spkrpts11.1/publicjudges.html).
- Llano, S. (2017). The counterfeit presentment: An early 20th century model of intercollegiate debate as civic education. *Argumentation and Advocacy: The Journal of the American Forensic Association*, 53(1/2), 90-102.
- Louden, A. D. (2010). *Navigating opportunity: Policy debate in the 21st century: Wake Forest National Debate Conference*. IDEA.
- Matthews, N. C. (2016). The influence of biological sex on perceived aggressive communication in debater–judge conflicts in parliamentary debate. *Western Journal of Communication*, 80(1), 38-59.
- Mayntz, R. (1993). Governing failures and the problem of governability: some comments on a theoretical paradigm. *Modern governance: New government-society interactions*, pp. 9-20. Thousand Oakes, CA: Sage.
- Mazilu, S. (2002). Debate- A way of training for success. *Journal of the National Parliamentary Debate Association*, 7, 35-41.
- McBath, J. (1984). *Rationale for forensics*. Speech Communication Association, 5-12.
- McCroskey, J. C. (2015). *Introduction to rhetorical communication*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- McKeon, R. (1975.) Arts of invention and arts of memory: Creation and criticism. *Critical Inquiry*, Vol 1 (4), 723-739.
- McGee, B. R. (1993). The next generation of CEDA educators. In. Thomas, D. A. & Wood, S. C. (Eds.), *CEDA 1991: 20th anniversary assessment conference proceedings*. 139-168. Dubuque, IA: Kendall Hunt.
- McGee, B. R. (1998). Which audience? Problems and prospects for public debate. *The Southern Journal of Forensics*, 2, 315-325.
- McGee, B., & McGee, D. (2000). Announcing the death of the cross examination debate association: Ideology and the locus of organizational identity. *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta*, 85, 1-24.
- Mendelson, M. (1997.) Everything must be argued: Rhetorical theory and pedagogical practice in Cicero’s De Oratore. *Journal of Education*, Vol. 179 (10), 15-48.
- Mezuk, B. (2009). Urban debate and high school educational outcomes for African American males: The case of the Chicago debate league. *Journal of Negro Education*, 78(3), 290–304.

- Mezuk, B. & Anderson, S. (2012). Participating in a policy debate program and academic achievement among at-risk adolescents in an urban public school district: 1997–2007. *Journal of Adolescence*, 35(5), 1225-1235. doi: 10.1016/j.adolescence.2012.04.005.
- Mezuk, B., Bondarenko, I., Smith, S., & Tucker, E. (2011). Impact of participating in a policy debate program on academic achievement: Evidence from the Chicago urban debate league. *Educational Research and Reviews*, 6(9), 622.
- Mezuk, B., Bondarenko, I., Smith, S., & Tucker, E. (2011). The influence of a policy debate program on high school achievement in a large urban public school system. *Educational Research and Reviews*, 6(9), 622–635.
- Murphy, J. J., Katula, R. A., & Hoppmann, M. (2013). *A synoptic history of classical rhetoric*. 3<sup>rd</sup> Ed. New York, NY: Routledge.
- NDT (2017). *National debate tournament*. Retrieved from <http://ndt.org/>.
- NEDA (2017). *National education debate association*. Retrieved from <http://nedadebate.org/>.
- Olasky, M. N. (1989). The aborted debate within public relations: An approach through Kuhn's paradigm. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 1(1-4), 87-95.
- Osborne, A. (2005). Debate and student development in the history classroom. *New Directions for Teaching & Learning*. 103, 39-50.
- Padbury, R., & Zhang, X. (2011). Lithium–oxygen batteries—limiting factors that affect performance. *Journal of Power Sources*, 196(10), 4436-4444.
- Padrow, B. (1956). Let's stop calling them educational. *The Speech Teacher*, 5, 205-206.
- Paxton, A., & Dale, R. (2014). Leveraging linguistic content and debater traits to predict debate outcomes. *Proceedings of the 36th Annual Meeting of the Cognitive Science Society* (pp. 2741-2746). Austin, TX: Cognitive Science Society.
- Peterson, D. K. (2014). *Debating race, race-ing debate: An extended ethnographic case study of Black intellectual insurgency in US intercollegiate debate*. (Doctoral dissertation) University of California, Irvine.
- Plato, The Dialogues of Plato translated into English with analyses and introductions by B. Jowett, M.A. in five volumes. 3rd Ed. Oxford University Press, 1892). 5/16/2017. <http://oll.libertyfund.org/titles/766>.
- Plato. (1952). *Gorgias*. (W. Helmbold, Trans.). Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill.
- Poster, C. (2005). *Protagoras*. Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy. Retrieved 2017. <http://www.iep.utm.edu/protagor/>.

- Potter, S. (1947). *The theory and practice of gamesmanship*. Kingston, RI: Moyer Bell.
- Quintilian. (1911). *The tenth and twelfth books of the institutions of Quintilian*. (H. Frieze Trans.). New York: American Book.
- Rathmann, R., Szklo, A., & Schaeffer, R. (2010). Land use competition for production of food and liquid biofuels: An analysis of the arguments in the current debate. *Renewable Energy*, 35(1), 14-22.
- Roueche, J. E. (1997). *Embracing the tiger: The effectiveness of debate and the community college*. Annapolis Junction, MD: Community College Press.
- Rowland, R. C. (1984). The debate judge as debate judge: A functional paradigm for evaluating debates. *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, 20(4), 183-93.
- Rowland, R.C. (1990). On mythic criticism. *Communication Studies*, 41, 101-116.
- Seawright, J. & Gerring, J. (2008). Case selection techniques in case study research. *Political Research Quarterly*, 61(294), 294-308.
- Schiappa, E. (2003). *Protagoras and logos: A study in Greek philosophy and rhetoric*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press.
- Shafer, D. M. (2014). *Deadly paradigms: The failure of US counterinsurgency policy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Shaw, B., Krause, N., Liang, J. & Bennett, J. (2007). Tracking changes in social relations throughout late life. *Journal of Gerontology*. 62(2), S90–S99.
- Shaw, W. C. (1922). *The art of debate*. Boston, MY: Allyn and Bacon.
- Shakur, T. (1998). Keep ya head up. *Interscope Records*. Retrieved from [www.tupac-online.com](http://www.tupac-online.com).
- Sheckels, Jr., T.F. & Warfield, A.C. (1990). Parliamentary debate: A description and a justification. *Argumentation and Advocacy*, 27(2), 86-97.
- Shepard, D. W. (1973). Burden of what? *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, 9, 361-363.
- Sibeon, R., 2004. *Rethinking social theory*. London: Sage.
- Sipiora, P. (2002). Introduction: The ancient concept of kairos. In P. Sipiora, and J. Baumlin (Eds.), *Rhetoric and kairos: Essays in history, theory, and praxis*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

- Sloane, T.O. (1989.) Reinventing inventio. *College English*, Vol 51 (5), pp 461-473.
- Smith, B. (1918). The father of debate: Protagoras of Abdera. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 4(2), 196-215.
- Snider, A. (1984). Ethics in academic debate: A gaming perspective. *The National Forensic Journal*, 2, 119-134.
- Sperlich, W. (2006). *Noam Chomsky*. Clerkenwell, U.K.: Reaktion Books.
- Stake, R.E. (2005). Qualitative case studies. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.) *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed.) (pp. 443-466). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Steinfatt, T. (1990). College debate: a quarter century later. *Contemporary Argumentation & Debate*, 11, 66-71.
- Sullivan, D. L. (1992). Kairos and the rhetoric of belief. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 78(3), 317-332. doi:10.1080/00335639209383999.
- Swanborn, P. (2010). *Case study research: What, why and how?* London: Sage.
- Swinney, J. P (1968). The relative comprehension of contemporary tournament debate speeches. *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, 5, 16-20.
- Thompson, D. (2010). The politics of the census: Lessons from abroad. *Canadian Public Policy*, 36(3), 377-382.
- Turner, J. (1990). The misuse and use of metatheory. *Social Forum*, 5(1), 37-54
- Untersteiner, M. (1971). *The Sophists*. (K. Freeman, Trans.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (Original work published 1984).
- Usher, S. (1999). *Greek oratory: Tradition and originality*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Van Eemeren, F. H., Garssen, B., Krabbe, E. C., Henkemans, A. S., Verheij, B., & Wagemans, J. H. (2014). *Handbook of argumentation theory*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Wardy, R. (1996). *The birth of rhetoric: Gorgias, Plato and their successors*. London: Routledge.
- Walbank. F.W. (2010). *The problem of Greek nationality*. Cambridge University Press.
- Westwick, J. N., & Chromey, K. J. (2014). Exploring the canons of rhetoric through Phil Davison's campaign stump speech. *Discourse: The Journal of the Speech Communication Association of South Dakota*, 1, 74.

- Whately, R. (1963). *Elements of rhetoric*. (D. Ehninger, Ed., Trans.). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University. (Original work published 1828).
- Whately, R., & Ehninger, D. (2010). *Elements of rhetoric: Comprising an analysis of the laws of moral evidence and of persuasion, with rules for argumentative composition and elocution*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Whitworth, S. (1989). Gender in the inter-paradigm debate. *Millennium-Journal of International Studies*, 18(2), 265-272.
- Williams, J. D. (2009). *An introduction to classical rhetoric: Essential readings*. Chichester, U.K: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Wilson, J., & Arnold, C. (1964). *Public speaking as liberal art*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Woodhouse, B. B. (2004). Reframing the debate about the socialization of children: An environmental paradigm. *University of Chicago Legal Forum*, 85-149.
- Woolgar, S. (1991). The very idea of social epistemology: What prospects for a truly radical radically naturalized epistemology'? *Inquiry* 34, 377-389.

APPENDIX A

2014 CEDA NATIONAL CHAMPIONSHIP – JUDGES’ DECISIONS

Allen, Ben	AFF
Bausch, Michael	AFF
Cooper, Deven	NEG
Denney, Ashley	NEG
Hallinan, Blake	NEG
Johnson, Willie	NEG
Kozak, Christopher	NEG
Mendenhall, Beth	NEG
Montee, Andy	AFF
Short, Eric	AFF
Vincent, Christopher	NEG

## APPENDIX B

### 2014 CEDA NATIONAL CHAMPIONSHIP –PRESIDENT’S MESSAGE

Hi, my name is Paul Mabrey and I am the President of the Cross-Examination Debate Association or CEDA. I speak to you today on behalf of the Cross-Examination Debate Association Executive Council. Recently CEDA celebrated the conclusion of the college policy debate season with the CEDA national debate tournament hosted at Indiana University in Bloomington, Indiana. After four grueling days of competition, the team of Korey Johnson and Ameena Ruffin from Towson University emerged victorious as the 2014 CEDA national champions. They defeated the team of Rashid Campbell and George Lee Jr. from the University of Oklahoma. In doing so, Korey and Ameena made history as the first team of two African-American women to win a college policy debate national championship. They finished the CEDA national debate tournament first out of 170 debate teams en route to the CEDA national championship.

Instead of spending the month since the CEDA national debate tournament celebrating their victory and reflecting on their historic moment, they have been on the defensive. Stories have emerged attacking the champions from Towson and finalists from Oklahoma for their argumentative choices and style. These stories should not even be called stories. The stories lack research, integrity and represent the worst of our human bigotry. These attacks on Towson, Oklahoma and others in our debate community are motivated by racism and fear. These attacks are reprehensible, despicable and must not be tolerated.

The Cross-Examination Debate Association (CEDA) is unlike any other competitive forum. It uniquely enhances student’s research, argumentation and advocacy skills. Many people

may think about debate narrowly as training for legal careers, however, debate as practiced provides students with a much broader skill set. Debate trains students to succeed in any career path - from teaching, researching, activism, policy-making, or the law. The format itself is debatable, which teaches skills in advocacy that no other activity can match. One of the ways debate maintains this flexibility in training is by limiting number of formal rules and encouraging debaters to create the world of debate that best serves their needs and the training they desire. Debaters can advance arguments favoring a particular set of norms, but must be prepared to defend proposed norms against other alternatives advocated by their opponents. While in some competitive forums students are beholden to one interpretation of the game they play, the ability to innovate in actual debates is a feature of CEDA debate. Rates of speed, styles of delivery, types of resolutions, interpretations of resolutions, and paradigms themselves are constantly changing, creating a uniquely challenging format for all debaters. To an outsider, this contestation may be confusing or frustrating, but in the academic world of debate this contestation is what makes the activity innovative. The ability to innovate is necessary to be successful in any field, and debate trains innovation better than other activities.

The stories attacking the innovation, skills and intelligence of Towson and Oklahoma in that final debate round are nothing but thinly veiled racism. And in some cases, extreme cases of racial bigotry. What Towson, Oklahoma and many before them have done is raise the level of excellence required to be successful in debate. And not just in competitive college policy debate but in their respective schools as students and in their communities. Thank you Ameena, Korey, Rashid and George for continuing to fight, struggle and succeed as others wish to tear you down. I am sorry you have had to experience this and that CEDA has not done more to support you and your efforts.

Today, I propose that we launch CEDA 4 campaign. Who are the CEDA 4? Korey, Ameena, Rashid and George are currently being criticized and personally attacked for their hard

work in the CEDA finals. But they are also being attacked for representing a different style of debate. A style that challenges, innovates and asks questions that many in our community and society are not ready to grapple with. We must let the four debaters know that we stand with them and support them.

We will never have the time or other resources to respond to each and every attack made against members of our community. And nor should we respond to every act of offensive racism. We must not aid in circulating their ignorance, bigotry and violence. However, we must not let their stories continue without our perspective and our voice. We must flood media, social networks and other spheres of influence with our overwhelming messages of support.

Please take 5 minutes to do a few things. First, create a brief video introducing yourself and your support for the CEDA 4. For example, my name is Paul Mabrey and I support the CEDA 4 because they represent what is good about debate and the future of our society. Or my name is Paul Mabrey and I support the CEDA 4 because racism has no place in our communities. Obviously, feel free to speak at length for your support of them. Then upload your video to Youtube with the tag CEDA debate. This will help ensure that when people search for commentary on these controversies, the support for Korey, Ameena, George and Rashid comes through loud and clear. Second, take a picture of a sign saying I support the CEDA 4 because....You may choose to show your face or just the paper with the support. Consider changing your profile pictures to this photo. Third, use the hashtag #Isupportceda4 on facebook, twitter and your other social media networks. Finally, share these photos and videos with everyone you know. We want YOU (Korey, Ameena, George and Rashid) to know there are thousands of us who support you and that these acts of racism are unacceptable. Further, we want others who may follow in your footsteps to know that there is a place for them in the debate community. Thank you for taking the time to listen and engage. My name is Paul Mabrey and I support the CEDA 4 because they deserve better.

APPENDIX C

2014 CEDA NATIONAL CHAMPIONSHIP – JUDGING PARADIGMS

<p><b><u>Ben Allen – Aff</u></b></p>	<p>Debate is what you make it, so first and foremost ALWAYS DO YOU!!!!</p> <p>With that said most of my decisions are made off of what is said in the last 2 speeches, Impact comparison is really really important. I view the debate in terms of offense and defense. Offense wins games, defense wins championships! (except in debate)</p> <p>I hate most theory args (unless its super creative), I hate high theory, by high theory I mean all those white dudes who were clearly high when they were writing their sh***, If you read that stuff make it as real-world as possible! I hate debaters who just read into a computer screen and never look at the judge, stuff like that causes you to lose speaker points.</p>
<p><b><u>Mike Bausch – AFF</u></b></p>	<p>Mike Bausch Director of Debate, Kent Denver</p> <p>Do what you do best and I will try to leave my predispositions at the door. You can't win just because you are arguing something in line with my perspectives. My preferences about argument delivery shape my decisions far more than my preferences about argument content.</p> <p>Please include me in email chains during the debate; my email is <a href="mailto:mikebausch@gmail.com">mikebausch@gmail.com</a></p> <p>My preferences about argument delivery:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Effective communication matters to me. I like fast debate, but I almost always think debaters would benefit from slowing down to about 80 percent of their top speed. Debaters will also benefit from narrowing down more to develop their best arguments with additional evidence, explanation and comparisons. Arguments that I can't explain to the other team are not arguments that I am likely to vote on and I will not expect the other team to answer them.</li></ol>

2. Flowing and line-by-line debating matter to me. Identifying drops, providing judge instruction, doing impact or evidence comparisons, answering “so what” questions, and making “even if” statements are the most important part of debating. The speaking and “game” aspects of debate are what make our activity unique from other forums that could teach similar skills.
3. Evidence quality matters to me a lot. I think sustained and in-depth research is the most important skill debate teaches. I think a lot of teams get away with using poorly highlighted, under qualified, and badly warranted evidence. I prioritize voting for high quality evidence in my decision-making. If you take time to compare your evidence (claims, data, warrants) to your opponent's evidence I will try to default to your assessment as much as possible, and extend your skepticism to a limited degree. If I am given no instruction, then I will read evidence and dismiss arguments that aren't effectively supported in favor of better-supported arguments.

My preferences about argument content:

1. I like core of the topic arguments that show of what you have learned from your topic research this year. Well-developed execution of topic knowledge will always impress me. Generics are fine, but good debaters will make their generics seem specific through research and spin.
2. I think the affirmative should read a topical plan. Topicality helps to facilitate in-depth clash. I think fairness is an impact. I want judges to try to evaluate arguments fairly. I don't think topicality is genocidal. I think that there is room to creatively tie many critical theories to advocating government action and many more can be part of a well-prepared negative response to a topical affirmative.
3. I expect the negative to really clash with the affirmative. The negative must have links to the affirmative's plan, advantages, evidence, or cross-examination answers. Affirmative teams should use theory to limit out negative strategies designed to avoid clash. I am unlikely to prevent the affirmative from weighing their plan because of a “role of the ballot” argument. I think what an alternative does is important and should be compared to the solvency of the affirmative.

<p><b><u>Deven Cooper -</u></b> <b><u>NEG</u></b></p>	<p><b>High school debate:</b> Baltimore Urban Debate League  <b>College debate:</b> Univ of Louisville then Towson Univ  <b>Grad work:</b> Cal State Fresno  <b>Current:</b> Director of Debate at Fresno State University</p> <p><b>Speaker Scale</b>  29.5-30: one of the best speakers I expect to see this year and has a high grade of Charisma, Uniqueness, Nerve, Talent, and Swag is on 100.</p> <p>29.1 - 29.5: very good speaker has a middle grade of Charisma, Uniqueness, Nerve, Talent, and mid-range swag.</p> <p>29: quite good speaker; low range of Charisma, Uniqueness, Nerve, Talent, and mid-range swag.</p> <p>28.4 - 28.9: good speaker; may have some above average range/ parts of the C.U.N.T.S acronym but must work on a few of them and may have some issues to work out.</p> <p>28 - 28.3: solid speaker; needs some work; probably has average range/ parts of the C.U.N.T.S acronym but must work on a few of them and may have some issues to work out.</p> <p>27.1 - 27.5: okay speaker; needs significant work on the C.U.N.T.S acronym.</p> <p>&lt; 27: you have done something deeply problematic in this debate like clipping cards or violence.</p> <p><b>Judging Proper</b>  I am willing to hear any arguments that are well explained and impacted and relate to how your strategy is going to produce scholarship or policy action. I will refer to an educator framework unless told otherwise. This means I will evaluate the round based on how you tell me you want it to be framed and I will offer comments on how you could make your argument better after the round.</p> <p>Comparison and Framing is key for me.  I avoid the privileging of certain teams or styles over others because that makes debate more unfair, educational and makes people not feel valued or wanted in this community.</p> <p>I judge debates according to the systematic connection of arguments rather than solely line by line...BUT doesn't mean if the other team drops turns or other arguments that I won't evaluate that.</p>
---	--

They must be impacted and explained. PLEASE always point out reason why the opposing team is bad and have contextualized reasons for why they have created a bad impact. I DO vote on framework and theory arguments....I've been known to vote on Condo

Don't try to adapt to how I used to debate if you genuinely don't believe in doing so or just want to win a ballot. If you are doing a performance I will hold you to the level that it is practiced, you have a reason for doing so, and relates to the overall argument you are making...Don't think "oh! I did a performance in front of Deven I win." You are sadly mistaken if so.

Overall I would like to see a good debate where people are confident in their arguments and feel comfortable being themselves and arguing how they feel is best. I am not here to exclude you or make you feel worthless or that you are a "lazy" intellectual as some debaters may call others, but I do like to see you defend your side to the best of your ability

A few issues that should be clarified:

**Paperless:** Prep time ends when the flash is out of your computer. Any malfunctioning means your prep has begun again. If the opponent you are facing doesn't have a laptop you must have a viewing one or give up yours....do not be classist GOSH...

**Framework and Theory:** I love smart arguments in this area. I am not inclined to just vote on debate will be destroyed or traditional framework will lead to genocide unless explained very well and impacted. There must be a concrete connection to the impacts articulated on these and most be weighed. I will not vote on conditionality good alone...You better point out the contradictions in the 2AC/1AR. I am persuaded by the deliberation arguments and topical version of the Aff.

**Performance:** It must be linked to an argument that is able to defend the performance and be able to explain the overall impact on debate or the world itself. Please don't do a performance to just do it...you MUST have a purpose and connect it to arguments. Plus debate is a place of politics and args about debate are not absent politics sometimes they are even a pre-req to "real" politics, but I can be persuaded otherwise. You must have a role of the ballot or framework to defend yourself or on the other side say why the role of the ballot is bad. I also think those critics who believe this style of

debate is anti-intellectual or not political are oversimplifying the nuance of each team that does performance. Take your role as an educator and stop being an intellectual coward.

**Topic/Resolution:** I will vote on reasons why or why not to go by the topic...unlike some closed-minded judges who are detached from the reality that the topics chosen may not allow for one to embrace their subjectivity or social location. This doesn't mean I think talking about puppies and candy should win, for those who dumb down debate in their framework args in that way. You should have a concrete and material basis why you chose not to engage the topic and linked to some affirmation against acism/sexism/homophobia/classism/elitism/white supremacy and produces politics that are progressive.

**High Theory K:** i.e Hiediggar, Zizek, Butler, Arant, and their colleagues...this must be explained to me in a way that can make some material sense to me as in a clear link to what the aff has done or an explanation of the resolution...I feel that a lot of times teams that do these types of arguments assume a world of abstract that doesn't relate fully to how to address the needs of the oppressed that isn't a privileged one. However, I do enjoy Nietzsche args that are well explained and contextualized. Offense is key with running these args and answering them.

**Disadvantages:** I'm cool with them just be well explained and have a link/link wall that can paint the story...you can get away with a generic link with me if you run politics disads. Disads on case should be impacted and have a clear link to what the aff has done to create/perpetuate the disad. If you are a K team and you kick the alt that solves for the disads...that is problematic for me.

**Counterplans:** They have to solve at least part of the case and address some of the fundamental issues dealing with the aff's advantages especially if it's a performance or critical aff...I'm cool with perm theory with a voter attached.

**Race/ Identity arguments:** LOVE these especially from the black perspective, but this doesn't mean you will win just because you run them like that. I like to see the linkage between what the aff does wrong or what the aff has perpetuated. I'm not likely to vote on a link of omission.

	<p><b>Case Args:</b> Only go for case turns...they are the best and are offensive, however case defense may work. If you run a K or performance you need to have some interaction with the aff to say why it is bad.</p>
<p><u>Ashley Denney –</u> <u>NEG</u></p>	<p><b>Please include me on email chains -</b> ashley.denney612@gmail.com she/her Currently coaching at UTSA, previously at K-State.</p> <p>Big picture:</p> <p>Frame the debate for me at the top of the 2nr/2ar. Tell me what to vote on and why that's more important than whatever the other team wants me to vote on. *Tell me how to weigh impacts. If no one tells me what to prioritize and someone has an oppression/violence in debate impact, I will generally default to weighing that argument first.*</p> <p>Talk in paragraphs not blips. Give me pen (okay typing) time instead of speeding your way through large blocks of analysis. Slow down on tags. Very little frustrates me more than not being able to tell when you've gone from one card to another. Stay organized. Giving arguments names is nice. You don't have to be perfect on the line by line, but telling me when you're moving from the link to the alt debate or the ___ "disad" (or whatever) is nice.</p> <p>Slow down. I'd rather hear you make applications and talk about argument interaction than rattle through another three cards that say the same thing. I get that sometimes you need extra evidence and if there are different warrants, it makes sense, but think carefully about those decisions. To take advantage of your analysis, I need to be able to flow it so you can't rattle off at the same speed you would a card.</p> <p>Some specifics:</p> <p>Framework - I am becoming less and less persuaded by ground and fairness claims against critical affs. Framework is much more persuasive to me as a methodological/educational issue rather than a rules/theory issue.</p> <p>Kritiks - this is what I'm most familiar with. Have clear links and impacts, tell me what the alt is and what I should be doing as a judge. I generally start with the link and impact debate and then work from there. I've noticed I care a little less about the</p>

	<p>alternative than other judges, by which I mean even if I'm not totally convinced about alt solvency, I might still think that the K outweighs the aff. I'm more familiar with identity-based literature than with "high theory" literature, not necessarily a big deal, but an fyi. It's not that I won't vote on high theory or that I haven't been exposed to it at all, it's just a general note to avoid relying on buzzwords (which really is a good idea in general).</p> <p>Performance - Tell me how to evaluate your argument and why I should evaluate it that way.</p> <p>Theory - slow down on your theory debates. This is hard to win in front of me, so you need to spend real time on theory to win it. Reject the argument not the team is often more persuasive. General proclivities: severance perms are bad (although probably not a reason to lose), conditionality is good within reason (although critical conditionality arguments are a different question), word pics are cool, but might be cheating. You probably won't win that Ks are cheating in front of me. Case debates: love them. Sneaky case turns, impact defense, mini-Ks are all great.</p> <p>Policy arguments - generally lean probability over magnitude. I don't have a lot of predilections here because I don't judge a lot of these debates, but I'm capable of following and willing to vote on policy arguments.</p>
<p><b><u>Blake Hallinan –</u></b> <b><u>NEG</u></b></p>	<p>Debated 4 years at Kansas State University Graduate Assistant at Indiana University</p> <p>Big Tent: (stolen from Joe Koehle) There is no right way to debate. I don't enter a debate round already knowing what the ballot means or what my role as a judge is. I prefer this to be made explicit in the debate round. If both teams are in agreement, I will default to the implied role and meaning. If both teams are in disagreement, I will default to the framework established through debate. If both teams are in disagreement and do not debate the framing for the round, I will be very sad.</p> <p>Evidence: [Updated] I am very resistant towards reading substantive evidence after the round (excepting T or FW definitions and politics links or uniqueness). I think it's important to remember that debate is a communicative activity. I value research and quality evidence, but I would rather be able to <i>hear</i> the evidence than <i>read</i> it after the round. I'll call for contested</p>

	<p>evidence but if you want me to read other evidence after the round, give me reasons.</p> <p>Paperless Prep Time: [Updated] The timer stops when you hand your USB drive to the other team. In cases of email or dropbox, the timer stops when you click save or send (that also means stop fiddling with your computer. <i>If you read new cards in a speech, I will deduct the time it takes you to jump the new evidence to the other team from your prep time.</i> Don't steal prep. I'm not stupid.</p> <p>Theory Debates: [Updated] The claim "this is a voting issue" is not an argument and I will not vote on it. If you make and impact a theoretical argument, I will vote on it. Caveat: I flow on paper. I <i>need</i> pen time. If it's not on my flow, I will not vote on it.</p> <p>Topicality: [Updated] So far, I've only judged topicality arguments against critical affs so most of my preferences apply to that particular context: I find 'topical version of the aff' arguments compelling and important, I default to the assumption that T is distinct from FW, and specific, contextual impacts trump broad claims.</p> <p>Framework: [Updated] I really enjoy clash of civilization debates (and I'm sure this will change as I continue to hear this debates. I'll let you know when that happens). For the neg: Drawing clear connections from your interpretation to your impact matters. For the aff: describing the world of debate under your interpretation matters (alternatively, tell me why the world of debate doesn't matter).</p> <p>Stylistic preferences: [Updated] Big overviews make me sad and lower your speaker points- most overviews can be broken up and debated on the line by line. If you don't want me to flow line by line, please tell me how you would like me to evaluate the round. I am an expressive human- if you would like to know what I think of an argument, my face generally makes my opinions clear. If I can't understand you, I won't flow you. I will only say clear to each speaker once. After that, it is your responsibility to notice that I am not writing anything down.</p>
<p><b><u>Willie Johnson –</u></b> <b><u>NEG</u></b></p>	<p>I feel the need to fix this huge communication issue in the debate community it will start with my judging philosophy. If you are a debater who say any of the following "Obama is president solves for racism" or "we are moving towards less racism cause of Obama or LBS" and the opposing team reading a racism arg/advantage or</p>

colorblindness I will instantly vote you down with 25 points for the debater who said it.

Jumping: Novice please don't but if you must which you all will you have 20 seconds after you call for prep to be stop till I consider it stealing prep and instead of restarting prep I will just measure it by the ticker timer in my head (which you do not want). I suggest that you carry a debate jump drive, viewing computer or the cloud system. For Open debaters I get even more angry with the lack of competence you guys have with being responsible when it comes to jumping files and card. I have a soft warmness for debaters who are mostly paper and may involve me smiling like a boy with a crush don't be alarmed it is just me remembering my old days.

Speaking: I believe that clarity comes before all other ideals of what we often fantasize a good speaker to be, a debater has to be clear so that I spend more time analyzing and processing what is said then trying to comprehend what the hell is being said. This helps in the rebuttals when there is more cross applying of arguments instead of me sitting there trying to ponder what argument reference is being made. Speed is something I can adjust to not my general forte yet if you are clear I can primarily make easier adjustments (look I sound like a damn metronome). I tend to give hints towards the wrongs and rights in the round so I won't be put off if you stare at me every now and then. Debates should be a game of wit and word that upholds morals of dignity and respect do not be rude and or abrasive please respect me, the other team, your partner and of course yourself

The Flow: My hand writing is atrocious just incredibly horrible for others at least I generally flow tags, authors and major warrants in the world of traditional debate. Outside of that with all the other formats poetry, performance, rap, theatricals and so forth I just try to grasp the majority of the speech incorporating the main idea

The K: yeah I so love the K being from a UDL background and having running the K for a majority of my debate career, yet don't let that be the reason you run the K I believe that a great K debate consist of a in-depth link explanation as well as control of the clash. There should be Impact calculus that does more then tell me what the impact is but a justification for how it functionally shapes the round which draws me to have a complete understanding of the Alt versus the plan and there must be some idea of a solvency mechanism so that the k is just simply not a linear disad forcing me to rethink or reform in the *status quo* (K= reshape the Squo)

The T debate: First I find it extremely hard to remember in my entire debate career where I cast a ballot for topicality alone yet it is possible to get a T ballot you must have a clear abuse story I will not evaluate T if there is not a clear abuse story. Voters are my best friend and will become a prior if well explained and impacted, yet I do believe education and fairness have extreme value just want to know why.

The D/A: Well I actually find myself voting more on the Disad then the K I just think that the disad debate offers more tools for the neg then the K yet it is the debater who optimize these tools that gain my ballot, link debates should contain at least a specific link as well as a an established Brink generic links are not good enough to win a D/A ballot and any good aff team will destroy a a generic link unless there is some support through a link wall. Impact debates must be more than just nuke war kills all you have to place comparative value to the *status quo* now and after plan passage. Yet a disad is an easier win with the advantages of solvency deficits and the option of competitive counter plans.

The Counter Plan: Competition is key if there is no proof that the end result is not uniquely different from the aff plan it is less likely to capture my ballot. So C/P solvency and competition is where my voter lies on the C/P flow this involves establishing and controlling the clash on the net benefit. PIC's usually rely on proving that the theoretical value of competition is worth my jurisdiction.

Theory: cross apply T only thing with a theory debate that is different is you must be able to show in where the violation actually happens yet I find theory to be easy outs to traditional clash.

Framework: this is where my jurisdiction truly falls and it is the teams' job to not only introduce the functioning framework but to uphold and defend that their framework is worth singing my ballot towards. I have no set idea of a framework coming into the round your job is to sell me to one and by any means my job is not to look at what framework sounds good but which is presented in a manner that avoids judges intervention (really just the team that prevents me from doing the bulk of the work if any).

	<p>In general: I love a good old debate round with tons of clash and where there is an understanding and display of your own intellect I find it hard to judge a round where there is just a display of how well a team can read and make reference to evidence, usually I hope that ends or is done less coming out of the 1AR. I'm a man who finds pleasure in the arts and execution of organic intellect and can better give my decision and opinion based mainly on how one relates back to competitive debate, if debate for you is a card game then it forces me to have to make decision based off my comprehension of the evidence and trust me that is never a good thing, yet a round where the discussion is what guides my ballot I can vote on who upholds the best discursive actions.</p>
<p><b><u>Christopher Kozak – NEG</u></b></p>	<p>Experience: 4 years high school policy, 4 years college policy, 4 years coaching college and high school. Current director of debate at Rutgers-Newark.</p> <p>My judging philosophy/preference is simple. Make arguments. That includes a claim, a warrant and why in a world of competing claims does your claim matter. I don't have a judging "paradigm" and to say that I am a tablarasa is as naive as it is stupid. I am going to split the difference and just explain to you what kinds of arguments I am familiar with.</p> <p>I debated the K for most of college. I value K's that are nuanced, well explained, and clearly applied to a specific context. I like original thinking in debate and will try my best to adapt to any performance style that you wish present in the round. Just be aware to all teams when debating framework on these issues that I do not consider appeals to "objective rules" persuasive in the context of determining debate norms. Debate is a rare activity in which students are allowed to define the conditions of their own education. I take this aspect of debate very seriously. This does not mean I am hostile to "policy debate good" arguments, it just means that I am holding both teams to a high stander of explanation when evaluating framework arguments.</p> <p>I was mostly a straight up debater in high school so I am also familiar with the other side of the fence. I love a good straight up policy round. I am a current events junkie and find that form of debate extremely valuable. I would just say that the only thing you need to worry about in front of me in a straight up round is that I have a hard time flowing quick blipy analysis (who doesn't?). Again, not really my style of debate, but honestly if you just make sure you pause for a breath or something between arguments I will get everything you need me to get on my flow.</p>

	<p>It may sound like I have a lot of "biases" but I do honestly try to evaluate arguments exactly as debaters tell me to. These preferences mostly come into play only when debaters are not doing their jobs.</p> <p>Avoid having to adapt to me at all and just tell me what you would like my preferences to be and we will be straight.</p> <p>I welcome you to ask any specific questions you may have about my philosophy before the debate considering I don't have much of an idea about what to put in these things.</p>
<p><b><u>Beth Mendenhall –</u></b> <b><u>NEG</u></b></p>	<p><b>Experience:</b> 3 years of lay-style high school debate + 5 years/550 rounds of fast college debate (at Kansas State, primarily the 2A) + 2 years of part-time coaching (JMU)</p> <p><b>Normative commitments:</b> I fundamentally believe that debate is and should be an educational activity. I care deeply about its continued existence. Encouraging participation is also important to me.</p> <p><b>Cards vs Speeches:</b> I think I'm a pretty decent flow. I find myself calling for cards less than other judges. Generally I only do so to resolve a close, single-issue but many-card debate (like politics uniqueness) or to resolve a dispute about the content of a card. I believe the warrants should be in your speech, not just on the laptop you hand me after the round.</p> <p><b>I evaluate debates through an offense-defense paradigm. You must have offense to win.</b></p> <p><b>Theory:</b> I don't have a lot of experience participating in or evaluating theory debates. I don't have any particular aversion to conditionality or various types of CPs/Alts, though I think there is a strong argument to be made against many types/statuses. Go for theory if you need/want to, but don't think I'm going to enjoy it. Make sure you have an interpretation.</p> <p><b>Topicality:</b> Yes, please. I enjoy procedural debates about the meaning of the resolution, and will carefully flow a technical T debate. I would like to say that I'm open to debates about whether T is a voting issue, but I'm not sure what "reasonability" means other than "evaluate our competing interpretations based only on in-round abuse." I think T is fundamentally a debate about competing interpretations, your job is to tell me how to evaluate/compare</p>

interpretations. I don't think this makes me a "T hack" - I typically defended borderline Affs in the 2AR.

**DAs:** Don't read a DA without all the internal links - I'm not going to spot you any part of your story, because I hold DAs to the same logical and evidentiary standards as a 1AC advantage. I like, understand, and have experience with politics DAs. I think the direction of the link is more important than the direction of uniqueness - in other words, if you DEFINITELY win a link turn but lose UQ, the DA goes away.

**CPs:** Love them, think they're strategic. I ran a lot of PICs (word and otherwise) in my day, and enjoy the intricacies of a good CP debate. If you don't have specific solvency, don't just assume you can co-opt the Aff's. Explain how their solvency ev supports your advocacy too/better. If the CP has equal solvency to the Aff and no net-benefit, I vote Aff. Net-benefits can be pretty small though and still count.

**Kritiks:** Not much personal experience running them, but I'm familiar with all of the common Ks. More unusual stuff needs to be carefully explained to me. A big pet-peeve of mine is the giant, beautiful, repetitive and inefficient 2NC K overview - stop that! When I evaluate a K debate, three things are of primary importance: (1) what's the role of the ballot? (2) are there any epistemology/ontology issues that suggest I should ignore some aspect of the debate? (3) Does the alternative solve the K impact?.

**"Critical"/"Performance" arguments:** Not much personal experience running them, but I think they serve a very valuable function in the debate and human community. Some of my favorite, most educational debate rounds were against critical teams. I am open to non-resolutional debate, but I appreciate explicit explanation of WHY and HOW I am supposed to engage with the debate in a particular way. Self-serving role of the ballot's are hard for me to understand - if the ROB is "vote for the team that best " that seems to me like an impact and/or solvency question. Shouldn't the role of the ballot be something that both teams could be evaluated by? This is something I'm still working through.

**Debate about debate:** yes - it's good for our community and its good for you. BUT - I'd like some guidance from the debaters about how I compare a critique of community practice with a critique of USFG policy - does one take priority? how do I compare them? It's hard for me to weigh arguments about the community with

	<p>arguments about the USFG without some metric, so please provide me with one!</p> <p><b>Speaker points:</b> if there's a tournament distribution guide thing, I'll follow that. Otherwise, I'm not changing my speaker point distributions from what they've always been: 29+ is excellent, 28-29 is really good, 27-28 is decent, 26-27 suggests you need a lot of work, and below 26 is a punishment for something inappropriate or offensive. I will say that I consider speaking STYLE more than other judges might - smart argumentative moves are part of my speaker point evaluation, but I also care a lot about speaking with clarity, passion, and persuasion. More speed =/= more speaker points. Creative presentation is encouraged.</p> <p><b>ATTENTION NOOBS:</b> One thing that really bothers me is stealing prep time - unless a timer is running (for a speech, CX, or either teams' prep) you should NOT be talking, reading, writing, or prepping in any way.</p> <p><b>ATTENTION CARD CLIPPERS:</b> I have no tolerance for cheating, because this community relies to a large degree on trust. I need video or audio to prove that a violation has occurred, and I need the argument made by the other team, but if card clipping is proven I will punish it harshly.</p>
<p><b><u>Andy Montee –</u></b> <b><u>AFF</u></b></p>	<p>You can email me at any of the following:  <a href="mailto:OhNoD3Throwdown@gmail.com">OhNoD3Throwdown@gmail.com</a>  <a href="mailto:youcanjustputwhateveryouwant@gmail.com">youcanjustputwhateveryouwant@gmail.com</a>  <a href="mailto:kickthecounterplan@gmail.com">kickthecounterplan@gmail.com</a>  <a href="mailto:andymontee@gmail.com">andymontee@gmail.com</a></p> <p>I flow everything straight down. Everything. Down.  The 1NC gets to announce how many off case there are. If you're the aff and you cut them off and ask "How many sheets do I need?" then I will tell you that you are out of order.  Tech Notes: I flow on paper because I visualize the debate better when I see the entire page and my laptop screen is tiny. I try to flow warrants of cards. If you just yell out "Mark the card at bacon!" you have to physically mark the card on your computer. It is not the responsibility of the other team or myself to do so. . . At the end of the speech, you should be able to hit save on your speech doc and send it to the other team so they know where you stopped reading. I've noticed this becoming an increasingly prevalent issue at all levels of competition. This is a form of clipping cards.  When I judge clash debates, framework is a necessary evil for everyone. I don't necessarily mean traditional framework, but rather</p>

a framing of what is the question the debate is trying to answer. I'm down with critical arguments, but you must have a theoretical defense of how your aff functions if it is not the standard wham-bam-thank-you-plan. Please do not put me in the position of weighing a bunch of theory-type form arguments about framework vs a bunch of content-type impact turns. No one will be happy. Even the hippity dippities need a concrete interpretation that explains their vision of debate. Clarifying neg ground always seems to be the gaping hole in critical teams' defense of their interps. Critical arguments – I read them, but I don't know all of them. Rap, sing, dance, puppets, rituals, whatever. Your style of argument will not bother me. I don't like critiques that are blatantly floating PIK's. Conservative teams like to accuse all critiques of being PIKs, which I don't think is true. But if you're one of those debaters that like to recontextualize the alt in the 1NR with the line “that means we can do all of the aff except for X,” I will have strong feelings against you and will prefer to default to understanding the alternative as it has been explained in the 1NC and thus far.

Affs get perms. You need a link to your K anyway. That should make it so the perm is unable to solve the impacts of your criticism. But Jesus fucking Christ they get to say perm.

Example: direct revolutionary praxis vs strategic, opaque resistance. There are a ton of flavors of these methods, but at their roots they are competitive and produce good debates.

One other K note – I dislike when critical teams sandbag their good links for the bottom of the block. I prefer the best links come out early and get developed, rather than bank on the 1AR dropping your sweet card that has never been explained. Make your own decisions, but I don't like when an intricate argument only has one link and it's to “the state.”

"Performance" - All debate is a performance. This categorical distinction is stupid and arbitrary. Yeah, of course you can read a story to support your argument. People do that.

Disads and CP's – One good net ben > three bad net bennies. I think terminal defense can beat a disad. I'm not a huge fan of consults or word pics, but there's a time and place for everything. While I did not often run the CP/DA combo when I debated, I now coach teams that primarily do and have gained a late breaking respect for that style of debate. I'm not kicking anything for you, you make your 2NR bed and you lie in it. Sometimes, when I play never-have-I-ever, I admit I never read the politics disad.

	<p>Evidence – I'm going to call for it and I'm going to read it. This isn't parli. I have a pretty high standard for evidence.</p> <p>Random thoughts on debate:  Silly Affs deserve to lose to silly arguments.  Puns directly translate to increased speaker points.  Please phonetically pronounce all acronyms.  Cross-examination ends after 3 minutes. I don't like that debate has just become de facto alternate use prep time, but it bothers me. This isn't grand crossfire. The questions are rarely even productive, and you should be prepping. If you have to ask a clarification question like cp status, that's fine. Don't take this as a license to refuse to answer clarification questions, just watch yourself</p> <p>Other things that will bother me:  If you tell me to vote neg to vote aff, I will vote aff to vote aff.  Shotgunning 5 permutations in a row.  Please respect your partner. Some prompting is fine, sure, but it really bothers me when one person dominates a cross-x and obstructs another person's speech. I just pulled up my philosophy to include this line, but it turns out it was already here. So I'll just reiterate that it pisses me off.  Excessive and tasteless cursing. A bit can be alright for emphasis, but striving for word efficiency should encourage you not to serve me up a plate full of fucks.</p> <p>If you read a card and tell me to scratch it, I will only take it off my flow if you read it backwards. Chris Crowe taught me that.</p>
<p><b><u>Eric Short – AFF</u></b></p>	<p>Eric Short (updated June 2013)  University of Minnesota, Wayzata High School  9 Years Coaching College, 12 Years Coaching High School</p> <p>I'm updating this philosophy not because of a change in how I view debates, but based on others' reactions to how I judge debates. After the final round of the 2013 NDT, some people were "shocked" to find out I had "lost my critical edge." I don't think I have. Some questioned whether or not I was a "safe" judge for them, given I was no longer "on the fence" about where I fell on the judging spectrum. I take offense (a-fence) to that! Judging (mostly) clash-of-civilizations debates requires flexibility, but no matter the artificial constraints of policy v kritiks, it all boils down to winning link and impact arguments. Even others suggest I "pick a side" to get out of judging the dreaded clash-of-civilizations debates. Although tempting, I think debate is a great way for students to interact with a wide range of arguments, and that all those exchanges are important. Bad puns aside, I think (inasmuch as is</p>

possible) I am the same judge I have been since the previous update to this philosophy was written.

I judge debates in the way they are presented to me. This means you control the substance of the debate, not me. As such, anything is open for debate; the team that will win is the team that is best able to explain why their arguments are better than the other teams. Impact analysis is extremely important at the end of the debate. You probably won't like the decision if I decide what is most important. What follows are my predispositions about certain debate arguments. These are not necessarily truths, but if equally strong arguments are presented on both sides, I often default to the following beliefs.:

Topicality—is an evidentiary issue about competing interpretations. Each side needs to explain the arguments their interpretation allows (or does not allow) and how that interpretation affects strategy questions in debate. Neither side has an inherent right to any particular argument—you need to resolve the questions of why and how your opponents' strategy implicates yours. That being said, reasonability can be a persuasive argument IF debated as a question of a reasonable interpretation instead of as a question of a reasonable Aff. The latter often begs the question of what makes the Aff reasonable in the first place. T is a voting issue, and never an RVI. I think most critiques of topicality are debated at such a shallow level (you said T so you should lose) that they often function on the level of RVI (which is not a good level to be on). Throw-aways and T's designed to arbitrarily exclude the Aff are a waste of good 1NC time.

Theory—cheap shots are NOT an easy way to win my ballot. Conditionality is fine, although multiple contradictory positions can get you in to trouble.

PICs are fine, but CPs that PIC out of something not in the plan text (consult, conditioning, etc) are probably cheating. Keep in mind, Negs often win that their CP is theoretically legitimate not because it is, but because the Aff usually just gives in. As with topicality, I think these theoretical issues are best resolved by evidence—if you have the cards to justify your CP, you are probably in a good place. If you want me to consider the *status quo* as an option, you should tell me in the 2NR: I will not default for you. Outside of conditionality, I default to rejecting the argument, not the team unless instructed otherwise.

	<p>DA's—I prefer case specific DA's to generic ones, but all generic DA's can (and should) be made specific to each case. I think too often Aff's give too much credence to 3 card 1NC's without questioning the uniqueness of the impact, the internal link to the impact, etc. My subscription to the cult of uniqueness has expired, and I have yet to renew it.</p> <p>Critiques—I am familiar with much of this literature, as I coach and ran these arguments as a debater. My familiarity should not be read as an excuse not to talk about the assumptions/representations of the Aff and how those impact the policy the 1AC advocated. Instead, you MIGHT need less explanation of the argument in order for me to understand it, but, you still have to win the argument, too. The more specific to the Aff your critique is, the better.</p> <p>Paperless—please include me in the 'jump chain'/email before each speech. I will not open or read your speech document during your speech, but want the option of having evidence in front of me during CX and after your speeches. Prep time ends once a jump drive is pulled from the speaker's computer. This should provide ample time for the debate and time for me to adjudicate. Remember, the longer it takes to finish the debate the less time I have to adjudicate, so it is in your best interest to be efficient.</p> <p>Speaker points—are influenced by a variety of factors. While I do not have a specific formula for integrating all the variables, your points are reflected by (in no particular order): argument choice, clarity, execution, participation, respect for others, strategy, and time management. I tend to reward debaters for specific strategies, humor, personality and speeches free of disposable arguments.</p> <p>Card Clipping—having judged several of these debates recently, I thought I would add this to my judging philosophy. Card Clipping is cheating. If the other team catches you, and is able to prove you were clipping, you will lose and get 0 points for the offense. If you want to make a challenge, the debate will stop and it is up to YOU to prove the offense.</p>
<p><b><u>Christopher Vincent – NEG</u></b></p>	<p><b>LD PARADIGM!!!</b>  <b>Assistant Director of Forensics &amp; Debate Louisiana State University, Additional Conflicts: Holy Cross School, Dulles (TX), Brown School (KY), Success Academy (NY)</b>  This is my 13th year in debate. I competed for 4 years in high school, 5 years at the University of Louisville, and was the graduate assistant for the University of Louisville debate team. I have been actively coaching high school LD and Policy for the past 7 years</p>

and was previously the Director at Brown and Fern Creek, prior to becoming the Assistant Director at LSU.

TOC 2015 UPDATE: All ethics challenges will be decided through the infamous RuPaul Paradigm: "The Time Has Come for you to Lip Sync for your life."

I view my role as a judge as an educator. While I believe that debaters should shape this activity, I do not believe that judges are or even can be neutral in this process. I will always try to embrace the teachable moment in debate. I debated for 5 years in what the community deemed "performance debate." If you put me in the back of the room you either know me, read this, or a combo of the two. Long story short: Do what you do, be who you are, and defend your actions in the debate.

I evaluate debates holistically, which means I prefer the debate to tell me a story and it requires more than just winning your argument is true. You **MUST WIN WHY THAT ARGUMENT MATTERS**. I will attempt to evaluate the debate as objectively as possible. I say "as possible" because I do not believe that judges can truly be objective. We are all humans, and we all think and formulate opinions and thoughts. Failure to do comparative analysis in debate will result in messiness, and inevitably some level of judge interventions (which you don't want).

Here are a few of my predispositions coming into the round:

**I WILL NOT VOTE FOR ARGUMENTS THAT ARE RACIST, HOMOPHOBIC, SEXIST, OR ABLEIST IN NATURE!!!**

Depending on the nature of the offense, this may result in an automatic loss!!!

1) Speed- Slow down on the tag lines and the authors. I will yell clear **ONE TIME**. After that, I will put my pen down and stop flowing. So, please don't be mad at the end of the debate if I missed some arguments because you were unclear. I make lots of facial expressions, so you can use that as a guide for if I understand you.

2) Dropped Arguments- Dropped arguments are not enough for me to vote someone down. Don't expect me to automatically pull the trigger on a dropped argument without you doing the work necessary and giving me an in depth analysis of why that argument shuts down the entire debate. I evaluate debates holistically. =

3) Theory- Theory is not a substantive response to critical positions and arguments. This is not to say that I won't vote for theory, but you must prove **ACTUAL IN-ROUND ABUSE**. One of the unique aspects of debate, is that it gives us a chance to explore different positions, and to be critically self-reflexive. Thus, my

interpretation of the topic may not be the same as yours, and that is okay. Theory seems to limit the liberating and unique educational opportunity this activity provides us.

I do not believe in neutral education, neutral conceptions of fairness, or even ground, or limits. If you run theory, be ready to defend it. Actual abuse is not because you don't understand the literature, know how to deal with the argument, or that you didn't have time to read it. You should probably read their literature and engage it. I will still stand by this position. If you are not reading the literature then you probably link to their criticism in the first place. Don't be scared, just engage.

4) Critical Arguments- Don't run them just because I am in the back of the room. While I am familiar with a wide range of literature, and while I have coached students with a wide range of literature, I will not be impressed just because you do it too. There are implications to the things we talk about in debate, and I believe that our social location inevitably shape the beliefs and ideologies we hold. If you do not believe that there is a place for performative/critical arguments in debate, and if you believe that social location and subsequent discussions have no place in this space, I am probably not the judge for you.

5) PAPERLESS DEBATE: Prep time ends when the flash drive leaves your computer.

Finally, make smart arguments and have fun. I promise I will do my best to evaluate the debate you give me.

### **POLICY PARADIGM**

5 Years University of Louisville

Currently Director of Forensics & Debate Louisiana State University

I debated for 5 years at the University of Louisville and engaged exclusively in what the community deemed "performance debate." I believe that debate is what you make it and you only get out of it what you want and what you put into it. I expect that if you put me in the back of the room you either know me, read this, or it's a combination of the two. Be who you are and defend your actions in the round. The most important thing you should know about me is that I love debate and I believe that debate is a place where we should exchange ideas, beliefs, and differences. I view my role as a judge as an educator and while I believe that debaters shape the activity through the rounds, I don't believe judges are neutral in this process. That means I will always attempt to embrace the teachable moment in the debate round when given the opportunity.

I promise I will flow the round but will probably not use the flow the same way you do. I believe that the debate should tell me a story and so I want to know how the arguments interact with one another and how they function. I will not examine arguments as isolated parts of a speech, but instead holistically.

I don't believe affirmatives have to be topical. They can be, but they don't have to be. You should just defend your actions.  
**I WILL NOT VOTE FOR ARGUMENTS THAT ARE RACIST, SEXIST, HOMOPHOBIC IN THEIR NATURE.**

Speed: I don't really like it and I tend to believe that debate is a communicative activity. I am not a robot. I breath, will speak to you if you speak to me, etc. That means that I am a person and I would like for you to engage me as such. In return I will do the same. If you so choose to spew down in front of me, be comfortable with your decision but also be comfortable with my flow being half empty, and my pen that will suddenly stop writing.

**PAPERLESS:** Prep time ends when the jump drive leaves your computer and is in your opponent's hand.

Finally, make smart arguments, clash with your opponent, and defend what you say. I will do my best to evaluate the debate I am given. While I ideologically believe that identity shapes how we approach debate, and while I debated exclusively in one style, I was trained in traditional and nontraditional debate and so I will attempt to evaluate the debate I am given. That means if I have two right teams in the back of the room, by all means have your plan focus debate, just know where I am coming from.  
If you have any other questions just ask!!!

APPENDIX D

DEBATE ASSOCIATION DEFINITIONS

Abbreviation	Proper Name
NFL	National Forensics League
NSDA	National Speech and Debate Association (Formerly the National Forensics League. NDT - National Debate Tournament (NDT).
AFA	American Forensic Association
CEDA	Cross Examination Debate Association or CEDA
ADA	American Debate Association
APDA	American Parliamentary Debate Association
WSPDA	Western States Parliamentary Debate Association
NPDA	National Parliamentary Debate Association. (Formerly the Western States Parliamentary Debate Association
IPDA	International Public Debate Association
NEDA	National Educational Debate Association