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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

He who decides a case without hearing the other side... though he decide justly, cannot be considered just.

Seneca

With the conclusion of the final rebuttal speech, the thoughts of each debater no longer are concerned with the organization of material, the answering of arguments, and the summarization of the case, but rather along new lines. Each debater questions, "Did the judge understand my line of reasoning?" or "Did I satisfactorily refute the affirmative with both logic and facts?". Yet, as strange as it may seem, this question may never be answered. Soon the teams will know who won the debate, but they will probably never know why the decision was made.

The major reason for concern is the lack of agreement on debate judging even between the leaders of the debate world. It is this lack of agreement that creates a situation which undoubtedly accounts for the great disparity in ratings meted out by various judges to the same debate team in a given debate or during the course of a debate tournament. It is not unusual for a team to be rated "inferior" and "superior" on the same day and even in the same debate. In 1955, a Penn State woman's team was rated in five successive rounds as "below average," "adequate," "good,"
"very good," and "superior." Certainly the team's debating skill did not actually vary to such a marked degree. 1

Upon what real basis does a judge decide the winner of a competition debate? This question has been argued as long as there have been judges. "The principal disputants in the early controversy were James M. O'Neill who contended that the judge should function as an argumentation expert and award the decision to the team that did the more skillful debating and Hugh M. Wells who maintained that the judge should be a 'juryman' and decide in favor of the team that presented the preponderance of evidence on the issues." 2

This difference continues to exist today and has become even more important. Essentially, O'Neill believes that debate should be judged entirely on the technique of debating. Wells only recognizes the argument of each team to determine the winner. Obviously, the argument is an integral portion of the total technique, but it is only one portion. Growing from this early dispute came more ideas of how a judge should make his decision. Only recently have greater strides been made in establishing a standard for reaching such a decision. The American Forensic Association has made an excellent contribution by promoting the use of a

standard ballot. "One of the major achievements toward improved judging will be reached when, through continued use of this ballot, judges develop better agreement as to the weight of each criterion."³

The standardized ballot emphasizes the entire debating technique; it implies that there is an equal importance upon analysis, evidence, argument, refutation, and delivery. Therefore, the American Forensic Association, by acceptance of such a ballot, would believe as O'Neill that debate technique is the most important standard of judgment.

This ballot, however, will not guarantee that all judges will use the standardized criteria to reach a decision. Each individual varies in his critical thinking, in his analysis of the argument, and the determining of satisfactory refutation. This is commonly revealed when in a contest debate a panel of highly qualified judges are all given identical ballots and asked to judge on the same basis, and in most cases, the decision is split between the panel.

Therefore, the original question still remains: Upon what real basis does a judge decide the winner of a competition debate? This question led to the development of this thesis which was an attempt to determine "The Relationship Between the Theoretical and the Actual Criteria

³Lawrence E. Norton, "Research Directions in Debate," The Register, VIII (Spring, 1960), 11.
for Determining a Decision Debate. The purpose of this paper was to discover the relationship, if such exists, between what is generally taught as good debate technique and what is most often judged as sufficient grounds for awarding a decision. It was believed that if it were possible to correlate the two, competition debate could be more easily understood and the judgment more readily appreciated.

Statement of Problem

The purpose of this investigation was to determine if a relationship exists between the actual standard used by judges during a tournament and the theory taught in collegiate debate courses. It was believed that most judges base their decisions upon one of two factors: first, with the major emphasis upon the arguments presented by each team; or second, on the total debate skill of each team with most skills being approximately equal in value. The judgment based upon arguments includes the selection of arguments, refutation, and the amount of evidence used. Although other factors may be of some importance to such a judge during a debate, his emphasis is decidedly on the arguments of the team. The judgment based on the total debate skills involves the components of arguments, but having equal value are the other skills of the debater. These additional skills may be the debater's organization of ideas, his use of language, his delivery of the speech, ethics of each team, and any other factor considered as basic debate skill. Most debate skills
are divided into the areas of analysis, refutation, evidence, organization, and delivery. It is important to recognize that the selection of these five areas implies an emphasis on argumentation. If a judge should rate each of the five areas equal in value, he would be emphasizing argumentation since analysis, refutation, and evidence are all a part of argumentation and compose three of the five skills. Any time within this thesis that the term "argumentation school" was used, it refers to that person, writer, or debate judge who puts more than equal value on the argumentation elements and places a lesser value on the other skills whatever they might be. Whenever the term "skills school" was used in this thesis, it refers to that person, writer, or debate judge who tends to place an approximately equal value on all skills of debate. This difference between the two schools of thought can best be explained by the use of two examples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judge A</th>
<th>Judge B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refutation</td>
<td>Refutation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence</td>
<td>Evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery</td>
<td>Delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 %</td>
<td>20 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 %</td>
<td>20 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 %</td>
<td>20 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 %</td>
<td>20 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 %</td>
<td>20 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In these two examples, Judge A falls into the "argumentation school" because he placed 75 per cent of the total value on argumentation. The second example, Judge B, falls into the "skills school" because he placed equal value on each skill,
even though argumentation received a total value of 60 per cent. This study was designed to determine which of the two areas is considered most important by the judge, and what relationship it has with the theory of good debate as expressed by most authorities.

Specifically, an attempt was made in this study to answer the following questions:

1. What is generally taught as good debate in the textbooks used by colleges and universities?

2. Does a judge determine a winner of a debate by emphasizing the arguments of each team or by the total debate skill of each team?

3. If a judge decides the winner on total debate skill, upon what criteria does he place importance?

4. Does a "qualified judge" determine the winner of a debate on a different basis than a judge with less experience?

5. Do various types of judges agree basically on the criteria for judging a debate?

6. What is the relationship between the theoretical and the actual criteria for determining decision debate?

Limiting the Type of Debate Studied

The two basic types of debate practiced in society are substantive and educational debate. Each of the two types have several variations of form which are often followed. Only competition debate as practiced in colleges for educational purposes was studied. An explanation of the more
recognized forms of debate clarifies their difference from competition debate.

**Substantive Debate**

A common type of debate that is perhaps best known to the public is illustrated by politicians attempting to sway the voting population to a particular interest in an election. This form of debate is best known as substantive debate. Substantive debate is very close to educational debate in some ways; however, in its real purpose, it is quite the opposite. Instead of being concerned only with the style and ability of each debater, the objective of substantive debating lies much deeper and more immediate than that of educational debating. The debate is usually held before a group which is not concerned with anything except who is right and who should be elected. This particular proposition is of vital importance, and it determines the success or failure of each person.

The substantive debate is often found to be less formal in its appearance than the educational form. The speakers are not forced to comply with the formal rules and procedures, but may devote their attention to the development of their personal views. It is not to be believed that a substantive debate is conducted with an irregular format. Often in a direct clash between persons, the procedure is very formal. For the purpose of this study, the substantive form of debate was not considered; the entire emphasis was on the
Educational debate. The contrast between the forms of debate should be understood in examining this study.

**Educational Debate**

Educational debate is that type contest usually conducted under the direction of an educational institution with the main objective of providing an educational experience for students. Most colleges support some form of debate program to encourage and direct the students into the field of forensics. With national fraternities uniting students from several colleges, the use of educational debate is highly organized. A variety in the types of educational debates reflects the difference in needs and the adaptability of debate for educational purposes. A brief explanation illustrates the contrast between the seldom used forms of educational debate and the more common competition debate.

**Non-decision debate.**—Non-decision debate is sometimes employed for use of several teams within a school for the purpose of practice or for the entertainment of an audience. It may be conducted in any of several forms, but the important aspect is that upon the completion of the last speech, a decision is not granted and neither team is declared a winner. In some particular situations, it is possible to award a rating to each team for its total performance, but this would not necessarily establish a winner.
Direct-clash debate.—"In direct-clash debating, the focus is on the issues and the judge takes an active role in the conduct of the debate."" With the emphasis on issues, the procedure generally used is for each team to present an opening speech. After the completion of the definition of terms and the limiting of the topic to be debated, the affirmative team selects an issue and arguments are presented. A member of the negative refutes the arguments presented and is then followed by a member of each team giving a summation speech. Each of the speakers deals only with the specific issue presented. At the conclusion of the four speeches, the judge awards a decision as to which team won the argument on the issue. A member of the negative will then present an issue to be debated and each team is given two speeches to establish or refute the arguments presented. The judge then awards the decision according to which team won the clash on the particular issue. This procedure continues with the affirmative and negative team alternating their presentation until one team has won three clashes, thus won the arguments of three separate issues. The emphasis is quite obviously placed on the argumentation of each team, and the teams are judged on the ability to win an issue by use of evidence and reasoning.

Cross-examination debate.—The cross-examination style of debating is sometimes referred to as the Oregon Plan for debate. In this particular form, there is an exchange of speeches from both teams, with a total of two constructive and two rebuttal speeches by each debate team. The cross examination occurs between speeches when a member of the opposing team asks specific questions to the speaker who just finished speaking. The questioning and answering continues for a specified time and another speech is delivered with a second question-answer period following. The cross-examination debate is a form of competition debate. It is seldom used in tournaments but is recognized as important because of its educational value. With the exception of the questioning period, all aspects of cross-examination debate are like those of standard debate.

Standard debate.—For the purpose of this thesis, the standard form of debate was considered exclusively. Although the other forms have a place in the educational value of argumentation, the most popular method of conflict is the standard debate form. Therefore, throughout the entirety of the thesis whenever the term "debate" is used, it refers only to that which is considered standard debate.

Standard debate consists of reasoned arguments both for and against a given proposition set in a rational, organized form to provide the opportunity for rational decision making.
It is the use of rhetoric, as Plato stated, as "...a universal art of winning the mind by arguments, which means not merely arguments in the courts of justice, and all other sorts of public councils, but in private conferences as well." The organization used in standard debate is as follows:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First affirmative</td>
<td>Ten minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First negative</td>
<td>Ten minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second affirmative</td>
<td>Ten minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second negative</td>
<td>Ten minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First negative</td>
<td>Five minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First affirmative</td>
<td>Five minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second negative</td>
<td>Five minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second affirmative</td>
<td>Five minutes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the standard debate, at least one critic judge presides over the debate and his sole task is to determine the winner of the two teams. It is not possible for him to award a tie. He must decide which team actually did the better debating. However, the method by which he must make this decision is indefinite, and the purpose of this investigation was to determine the relationship of that which is theoretically used and that which is actually practiced in determining the winner of a competition debate.

The Organization of the Study

This study was designed to discover the basic theory of good debate being taught by most college professors and to determine as accurately as was possible the actual criteria.

---

employed by most judges. The decision as to what the proper standards for judgment should be shall be left to another time or another writer.

The location of a definition for good debate is open to argument. Therefore, three approaches were used to discover this portion of the thesis. First, a survey of the most used and accepted textbooks of colleges and universities was conducted. Second, the basic concepts of writers throughout the United States were revealed through a survey of the articles written in leading speech journals. Third, the types of ballots used in tournament competition and the emphasis expressed by tournament directors in the instruction sheets given to judges were investigated. From these three sources, the basis of the theoretical approach to good debating was derived.

The actual criteria most frequently used by judges were determined by the use of a specially prepared questionnaire that was used in several representative debate tournaments. The questionnaire was designed to discover the basic philosophy of the debate judge for evaluating debate. Specific debate skills were listed so the judge could rate each of the debate skills. Personal data was requested, providing necessary information pertaining to the type of judge completing the questionnaire. These questionnaires were then tabulated to determine the most commonly used criteria for judging debates.
The final chapter of the study relates the findings of both the actual and the theoretical criteria employed by tournament judges. The conclusion explains why several judges listening to the same debate will rank the teams quite differently; why a girls' team can receive five different ratings in five consecutive rounds of debate.

Survey of Previous Studies

Few of the experimental studies that have been conducted in the field of debate have sought to discover the basis for debate decisions. Most of the research has been undertaken to discover the effect of the speaker on his audience or the value of one debate speech over another. However, the following studies are related to the basis of a judge's decision and are therefore important.

General Studies of the Past

Harvey Cromwell made a study of debate in 1954. His major purpose was to discover the major effect of the first on the second argumentative speech. Within this study he sought to discover the importance of each speech and its total effect upon the listener as to the evaluation of the debate. 6

Merriel Jones initiated an experimental study on the effect of speech rate upon judgments. Within this experiment, he discovered that often the rate of the speaker does affect the comprehension of the judge, thereby affecting the judge’s decision.7

Thomas Ludlum set out to discover the specific devices used by the speaker to change the listener’s attitude of the question being debated.8 Finally, Donald Thistlethwaite sought to learn the factors which influenced the listener during the refutation period.9 Although each study does not ask upon what standards a judge makes his decision, the results do indicate the factors in a debate that affect the judge’s decision.

A different type study by William P. Halstead answered several questions that are always asked during a debate tournament. The basic problems were:

Do larger schools win most of the debates?

Will the host school win more than its share of the debates?

7 Merriel B. Jones, "An Experimental Study of the Effects of Speech Rate on Audience Judgments in Debate Situations," Speech Monograph, XXIV (June, 1957), 92.
9 Donald L. Thistlethwaite, "Factors Influencing Attitude Change Through Refutative Communication," Speech Monograph, XXIII (March, 1956), 1h.
On any given topic, will one side win more times than the other?

Do some schools continuously win year after year?

A total of 1320 debates composed the statistical study. In final summary, the conclusion was reached that there seems to be some justification for the belief that larger schools have a greater chance to win a debate. It was also discovered that on a given debate proposition one side will have a slight advantage over the other team. The results revealed that the entertaining school has a slight advantage over any visiting school. Finally, it was discovered that certain schools and certain debate coaches consistently win.

However, Halstead emphatically points out that on each of the above mentioned points there is an advantage but that "the advantage is so slight that, while it does influence a statistical average, it cannot have much influence upon the outcome of any given debate."10 These results indicate that factors at a specific tournament are more equal than is usually believed by most of the competing debate teams.

Halstead's study was concerned with the external questions of why certain teams win more frequently than others, and whether or not the host school has an unfair advantage over visiting schools. Though this study is important because it answered external questions, there still

remains a strong need to discover the major criteria for a judge's decision in competition debate.

Closely Related Studies

During the investigation into the problems of judging speech contests, James Noble Holm designed a questionnaire to help locate certain problems of judgment in various speech events. The questionnaire was formulated and distributed to two separate groups of teachers and students of speech. The first group of persons asked to assist in his study was composed of students enrolled at the summer session of the University of Wisconsin. The majority of the section was high school and college instructors who were at the university doing graduate work. This portion of the study was conducted in 1936 and included sixteen states and the then territory of Hawaii. More importantly, thirty-five colleges and universities contributed to the speech training of those persons answering the questions.

The second group examined was teachers who were in attendance at the annual speech and drama departmental meetings of the Northeastern Ohio Teachers Association in October, 1937. The majority of the questioned group was high school teachers with but a few persons being college instructors. The thirty-two teachers represented twenty-five colleges and universities.

Sixteen questions were asked in the questionnaire, and with each question, a number of possible answers were listed.
Each person was asked to indicate his personal response to the several objective answers. The sixteen questions dealt with all areas of public speaking; only one question was specifically designed for debate. Therefore, the study was for speech in general and not especially for the field of debate. In addition, the study was aimed at the teacher and not at the contest judge used in actual tournament competition. The question that was asked about debate is as follows:

QUESTION: Methods and standards of judging debates. In the following groups underline the one phrase in each group which you would count most important in arriving at a just decision.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group I</th>
<th>Group II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Audience reaction</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debater's ability</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argument and evidence presented</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Logic and reasoning</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persuasion</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Rapid delivery; enthusiasm</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversational, analytical delivery</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Fluency of presentation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accuracy of analysis</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Clear, coherent organization</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective rebuttal</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Weigh the following items, indicating the relative value you would assign to each in judging a debate, using 1 for items of prime importance, 2 for those of less importance, 3 for those considered slightly, and 0 for those not considered at all.

11 James Nobel Holm, How to Judge Speech Contests (Portland, 1938), pp. 211-216.
It is important to notice that in this study, the information gained was derived by placing one concept against another. It is necessary to realize that those questions asked were directed to teachers of speech who will certainly often be contest judges, but who will not compose the entire staff of judges to be used in any given tournament. However, it is obviously apparent that the information gained is important in the total value placed on certain criteria for debate judgment. In this study, Holm presented a basis for determining the debate skill areas most used by judges in determining the winner of a debate. The choice of standards used by Holm was considered in selecting the skills for the special questionnaire used in this thesis.
Study by Kim Giffin.--The best single study designed to discover the criterion most often used by debate judges was made by Kim Giffin. The study was conducted at the University of Kansas in 1957, and was based on the educational values of debate as related to the judge's standard of judgment. The tournament was an annual affair attended by eighteen schools of the states of Oregon, California, Texas, Minnesota, Florida, and New York. It is vitally important that such wide areas of the United States were represented in that each school was required to furnish one qualified judge from the school. This provided a very large and representative field of debate judges. The remainder of the judges were obtained from the University of Kansas and other nearby colleges and universities. Each judge was asked to fill out the specially prepared ballot after each round of debate; the ballot sought to discover the real basis for determining the decision. Several months later, after each judge had adequate time to forget each round of the tournament, he was sent an additional form seeking more information. This second ballot was directed to discover what basis he would normally use to determine a debate. This second attempt was to check the accuracy of the first ballot, and also to discover if the criteria used immediately following a debate would be the same as that expressed without actually having heard a debate. Interestingly enough, the ballot of each judge was completed and returned to the
University of Kansas. The study revealed that the Spearman rank correlation coefficient between the questionnaire replies from the judges concerning the weight ordinarily given to each criterion, and the actual weight given during the tournament debates was high, rho = .92, significant at the one per cent level of confidence. The results of the study are as follows with the seven areas of the predetermined sheet composing 96.88 per cent of the total findings and the write-in area only 3.12 per cent of the total.

1. Ability to speak well (delivery) 14.65%
2. Selection of logically defensible arguments (case) 19.10%
3. Support of argument with information (evidence) 17.18%
4. Perception of irrelevant or irrational arguments (refutation) 17.00%
5. Phrasing of concepts clearly and concisely (language) 5.29%
6. Ability to analyze the topic area (analysis) 14.78%
7. Ability to organize ideas into a structured whole (organization) 8.88%

TOTAL 96.88%

This study by Giffin served as a foundation for this thesis in determining the standards of judgment. The results of his findings served as a basis for the selection of debating skills used on the special questionnaire which was designed for this study. In both studies, the judge recorded the percentage value attached to each of several skills. The results of the findings from the questionnaire could then be compared to the results recorded from Giffin's study.

Chapter Summary

In summary, it is believed that most judges base their decisions upon one of two factors: first, emphasizing the arguments of each team; second, emphasizing the total debate technique of each team. The standard based upon arguments includes the selection of arguments, the amount of evidence used, and the debate skills; however, more weight is given to argumentation. Total debate technique considers arguments, but also places equal value upon the skills of the debater—his organization of ideas, his use of language, the delivery of the speaker, ethics of each team, and any other factors considered as basic debate skill. This study was designed to determine which of the two areas the teacher and the judge consider more important. The major purpose of this thesis was to discover the relationship between what is taught as good debate and what is judged as good debate.
The bases for judges' decisions were discovered by surveying the leading college textbooks of debate, debate articles in speech journals, the actual ballots of debate tournaments, and using a special questionnaire for debate judges in actual tournaments. Each of these phases composes a separate chapter.

Two closely related studies conducted by James Noble Holm and Kim Giffin were examined to help establish the criteria for judging debates. The material revealed within the two studies served as a means of comparison with the results of the special questionnaire designed for this investigation.
CHAPTER II
THETHEORETICAL CRITERIA FOR DETERMINING
DECISION DEBATE—DEBATE TEXTBOOKS

Deciding the winner of an athletic event is a relatively simple matter. One need only ask oneself who crossed the goal the most times, had the best time record, had the lowest score, or whatever physical criterion is used to determine the winner. Judging any speech contest, however, is a far more complex task than determining the winner of the athletic event. Like judging a piece of fine art, the critic must decide primarily on a personal evaluation of the particular work. The specific characteristic that one piece of art reflects may appeal to one person while to another the reaction may be the complete reversal.

The person asked to judge a speech fully realizes that the task can be a very bewildering experience. Deciding the winner of a contest debate becomes an even more perplexing issue. In addition to evaluating four separate speakers, the judge discovers that the constant interplay of one speech upon the other quickly complicates his decision. In any typical debate, the judge must evaluate arguments as they are presented. A member of the opposing team offers refutation
to the argument; then the rebuttal of ideas continues to complicate the discussion until the lay debate judge may feel that an accurate appraisal of the debate is impossible.

However, as in the judging of any piece of art, there must be a standard by which the critic judge may make an accurate decision in declaring a winner of the event. This standard not only assists the critic in making his decision but in addition, it serves as a means of presenting constructive criticism to the teams for use in future debates. It is doubtful that any judge could account for each detail of such a complicated speech activity as debate; but it is necessary to construct certain criteria that can assist the judge in making his decision.

Criticism has the double advantage of providing a sense of values to the judge as well as to the debater. Until a debater has a thorough knowledge of what is expected of him, he is unable to improve his performance. The critic in making a decision must be alert to the specific points of evaluation. The debate instructor must have an understanding of the criteria distinguishing the excellent debate from the poor debate. With this knowledge, the teacher of argumentation may then guide his students to a higher level of performance. Therefore, a standard of judgment is important to each of several persons involved in debating.

The purpose of this chapter was to discover by investigation the theoretical criteria for determining the winner
in a decision debate. Each major source of material was studied to help develop an overall coverage of significant ideas in the field of argumentation. The first task of the chapter was to determine the qualities a person should have in order to serve as a judge of competition debate.

The Critic Judge

In considering how a debate will be judged, the first question which invariably must be asked is, "Who shall be the critic judge?" M. J. Holcomb states, "The critic-judge system has certain weaknesses that would perhaps be diminished through a more careful selection of the individuals who are asked to serve as a critic judge." Another prominent person involved in debate expresses his feelings about judging debate in relation to teaching debate.

It seems the height of inconsistency for us, as coaches, to stress to our debaters the importance of knowing and following the rules of debate, and then to subject them to be judged on how well they have learned and are able to apply what they have learned, by a judge who is not familiar with the yardstick by which the progress of these students should be measured. Surely this can and does lead to frustrating experiences by these students. Small wonder that they return home with a question in their mind as to the wiseness of "following the rules" when they meet judges who have no acquaintance with these rules, and thus sometimes reward the flagrant violation of the basic code of competitive debate. 2


If only by the simple definition of the speech contest alone, there must be proficient judges lest the entire purpose of the debate be destroyed. Poor judging of events can and often does lead to the ruin of a contest; it destroys the responsive and growing desires of a young student aspiring to become a competent speaker. If the purpose of debating is for the development and growth of the student, then it is only natural that the selection of proper contest judges reflect educational values of the students involved.

The natural question, therefore, must be asked, "Who should be selected to judge the debate?" The basic standard for determining a judge is that he should have speech training in the area of debate. "As you would not go to a blacksmith to have a tooth pulled, or go to a grocer for legal advice, do not ask any given individual, no matter how prominent he may be in your community, to judge a contest unless he has had experience in the work he is being asked to judge."^3

A Qualified Judge

A contest manager in preparation of a tournament must provide the number of "qualified" judges needed for the various events. Since most tournaments are quite large in the number of schools attending and in the number of debate

---

^3 James Noble Holm, How to Judge Speech Contests (Portland, Maine, 1938), p. 64.
teams participating, it becomes almost an impossible task to locate enough persons in the community with adequate debate background to serve as judges. Therefore, it is common practice for a tournament director to require the entering schools to provide a portion of the judges. The specific instructions often received from a director simply state:

One qualified judge shall be provided for each two debate teams entered. This judge shall be familiar with debate, preferably a member of the speech department. Graduate students are not acceptable as judges. If you cannot bring the required number of judges, the host school will furnish them at a cost of _______ per judge. 4

As a result, "The required number of qualified judges are not available, and the head of this department, the wife of that faculty member, and the minister down the street are called in—all well qualified in their own field, but by their own admission not qualified as debate judges; and the 'power of persuasion' becomes a more valuable tool in this contest than the 'art of debate' "5

The director of the tournament must furnish the remaining judges, and he often allows himself to choose school superintendents and principals, lawyers, clergymen, and well-known businessmen who may have donated the awards to be given to the winners. Other than the convenience for the director, the selection may be made because each person has a

---

4Baker, op. cit., p. 66.
5Ibid., p. 67.
college background and is considered impartial in his
decisions. Carroll Lehman in his book Debate Coaching
explains that certain persons are not qualified as judges.

Preachers because of sex, and often undesirable,
speech habits, and because of a tendency to respond
unduly to emotional appeal; lawyers because by
training they attach great importance to black-
and-white evidence. . . . School superintendents
and principals because in judging high school
debates there is danger of inter-school politics. . . .
College training and experience in judging,
however, may affect the defects listed and make
these people as valuable judges as can be secured
anywhere. 6

Desirable Characteristics of a Judge

The debate judge needs much more than just "a debate
background." James Noble Holm in his book How to Judge
Speech Contests listed eleven different qualities that a
critic judge must have in order to be an adequately prepared
judge.

The first specification for a good critic judge is a
recognition of the debate from an educational viewpoint. He
should think of the speech contest as an incident in the
educational process, and he should know the educational value
of the event. His awareness of the standards of the contest
is necessary if he is to render a valid decision. Second, he
should have a thorough training in the speech arts. It
should be understood without stating that the judge needs a

6Carroll Lehman, Debate Coaching (New York, 1936),
p. 224.
background in the fundamentals of speech, but far more important, he should know that he is a critic judge. Third, criticism and judgment should always be included within any contest. If a judge makes a decision and is unable to make constructive criticism, he has accomplished only half of the task before him. Fourth, he should know the function, objective, theory, and practice of the event. Besides the knowledge of the procedure of debating, he should have a thorough knowledge of the argumentation and the strategy used in a superior debate. Fifth, an often overlooked but most important quality of a good judge is his sympathy toward contest work. Unless the judge is interested in speech contests, he will be unable to properly apply his knowledge or ability to the task of evaluating the debate. Sixth, he should have a keen analytical ability; he must be able to determine the reasons for the success or failure of a team. He should have the insight to analyze the material presented and the arguments refuted to determine the true merit of the team's case. This analytical ability is fundamental to the entire evaluation process. Next, the judge should at all times be impartial and prudent in his decision. Despite any personal, political, economic, or social beliefs, a judge must give a fair evaluation to any speaker, ruling on the ability exhibited and not on the stand taken by the contestant. Eighth, the contest judge should work to keep himself out of the contest. A judge often has a tendency to
want the debater to do exactly as he would if he were speaking. It is easy for a judge to demand more of a student than the student is capable of performing. Therefore, "it is the judge's responsibility to evolve an objective and impersonal standard of judgment, that will neither feminize the charm of womanhood, nor emasculate the vigor and robustness of manhood," and will accomplish the objectives of debate. Having once made his decision to the best of his ability, he must maintain a certain steadfastness in his decision and be able to defend his reasons. The competent judge should always have a background and proper perspective in economics, sociology, political science, and literature. Only with a sufficient background in each of these fields can he evaluate the material and supporting evidence used by member teams; however, he should not allow this background to dominate his decision. For instance, a judge once told debaters that their stand on the British radio system was wrong. "I've been in England myself and I don't know how your arguments can be true." Finally, he should be capable of delivering useful oral criticism. In giving his criticism, the judge should not be guilty of the faults of the debate on which he is commenting. The critique should be


8Holm, op. cit., p. 49.
friendly, fair, direct, and sincere for the benefit of the four debaters and any audience that may be present.

**Two Basic Types of Judgment**

If debating is designed to serve as an educational process, and if actual debate is part of the program to train debaters, it is only natural that the best critic judge would be a debate coach. Usually it is agreeable to the schools and to the debaters to have a debate coach serve as a critic judge. There are many opinions as to the characteristics that he should have, but most people would fall into one of two basic schools of thought.

First, the ideal judge is considered to be a person who knows all the technicalities of debate, knows the debate topic, and is familiar with various areas of it, puts aside his personal prejudices, and does not have any close ties with the school or the debaters he is judging. He must feel that debate is an educational activity. The importance of the debate is not winning, but the training in the art of persuasion. Therefore, the debate should be judged by a person who is able to decide which team did the better job of debating. Quite obviously, a competent debate coach could qualify by these standards.

---

A second basic concept in determining who should be a judge is only that he be well versed in the techniques of logic. It would mean that he should know logic thoroughly, understand the logical development of a policy question, and familiarize himself with the obligations of the affirmative and negative teams in handling a question. His major concern as a judge should be which team did the better job of argumentation. The team which won the arguments presented and was capable of best refuting the opposition would be strong concerns of the judge. Basically, the judge must constantly resist the temptation to judge truth on nonrational grounds, and he must base his decision on the debate as it is presented.  

The major difference between the two approaches is that one emphasizes the argumentation of each team while the much broader approach considers argumentation but also recognizes the many other aspects of debate skill.

A Survey of Leading Debate Textbooks

The survey consisted of an investigation of popular textbooks of argumentation. For each textbook, the survey revealed the amount of material devoted to the evaluation of debate and the basic philosophy revealed by the author. Concluding the section on debate textbooks, the volume written by George McCoy Musgrave was analyzed since it is

\[10\text{Ibid.}\]
considered the "Roberts' Rules of Order" for debate. This book on rules completed the textbook coverage of the theoretical criteria for determining decision debate.

**Early Textbooks**

During the 1930's several argumentation textbooks were published to assist in the teaching of debate. Three of these books were selected for review, even though their copyright date is more than thirty years old, because they served as a basis of instruction for many debate coaches and judges of today's tournaments.

The first textbook selected was *Argumentation* by James Winans and William Utterback, copyright date, 1930. The chapters cover all areas of argumentation and refutation but do not make a specific reference to standards for judging. A companion volume, *Argumentation and Debate* written by William Trufant Foster in 1932, gives no particular reference to the contest judge and his evaluation of the debate. The third textbook, *Handbook of Argumentation* by Russell H. Wagner, 1936, also fails to devote any special attention to the judging of debate.

---


12 William Trufant Foster, *Argumentation and Debate* (Boston, 1936).

Two of the textbooks were directed toward argumentation and not necessarily debate. A writer concerned with argumentation would not have to deal with debating. Therefore, it may not be extraordinary that the above early textbooks did not mention debate judging standards. It is important to recognize that these early textbooks, which could have served as a basis for the instruction of debate, did not give any assistance to the judge or to the student in the specific area of judgment.

**Later Textbooks**

*Oral Decision Making.*—During the period between the publication of the books in the 1930's and the more recent publication of the books of today, few debate textbooks were published. One of these books, *Oral Decision Making* by Waldo W. Braden and Earnest Brandenburg, 1955, devotes a separate chapter to the discussion of evaluating debate. The basic criteria for judging are the same techniques used for effective debating. To assist the critic judge, the material covered in several chapters of the book is divided into eight different categories, each standard representing a separate area of the total performance of the individual speaker. The areas of concern are analysis, organization, argument and supporting facts, refutation, language, delivery, attitudes, and overall effectiveness.\(^\text{11}\)

The authors indicate that the final decision is usually derived by giving a rating to each speaker in each of the various eight categories. The total of the criteria ratings then reflects the winner. Obviously, this philosophy positions itself in the "total debate skills" school of thought.

Argumentation, Discussion, and Debate.--In his book, Craig Baird explains that at present there is not, nor is it likely there ever will be, a universal set of criteria for judging a debate. However, he believes that certain standards are acceptable in most situations. His initial comment is that traditionally it is believed that "material is more important"\(^\text{15}\) than form. However, he then lists the definite areas for consideration, most of which deal directly with form. By material, Baird refers to the arguments presented and the evidence used to prove the case of the debater. Form would be the method of presentation by the speaker and would deal directly with his delivery, organization, and persuasive power of relating the arguments to the listener.

The first specific area listed in the very brief discussion of evaluation is "definition and analysis." For


\(^{16}\) Ibid., pp. 361-370.
the judge, the debater must define and analyze the debate question accurately, clearly, and reasonably. If the analysis is peculiar and seemingly devised merely to throw the other team off guard, the team should be penalized accordingly. However, Baird does not express to what degree the penalty should be placed on the team. His second area is listed as "arguments and evidence." In this section his direction is not on argument or evidence, but rather the effective use of specific instances, analogy, authority, causal reasoning, and the absence of fallacies in the chief propositions. He does not clearly explain whether the presence of fallacies should penalize the team if the fallacies are discovered only by the critic judge himself. The third item is "evidence." The judge should examine the evidence for accuracy, relevance, consistency, and persuasiveness. Fourth is "structure" in which the judge looks for clearness, order, proportion, and contribution of each speech to the team's case. Fifth, the author recognizes the persuasive elements involved in the debate by using "audience adaptation" as a separate criterion. Sixth, the critic makes his decision on the basis of language. He should observe and consider features of the speakers that are acceptable oral style. He does not explain to what degree or upon what level the importance should be placed. Seventh, refutation and rebuttal must be included. The judge is told to consider selection of points to be refuted, general and
special methods, position and amount and the inclusion of new evidence. Very little else is given to help explain what is meant or to what degree refutation must be valued.

Delivery is the next area of importance. The judge should listen for the directness of communication, conversational mode, sincerity, and effectiveness in voice and bodily activity. The final area for judgment is the general effectiveness of the team. In this area, the critic would not simply see the debate composed of several individual units to be judged but would weigh the entire presentation by each team to determine its effectiveness. 17

The nine sectional breakdowns listed by Saird do not completely handle the criteria for judgment. Even though the areas are specifically listed, he makes no attempt to determine the value of each skill. He simply states that they are not of equal value and then dismisses any consideration of the value of each field. In each of the nine areas of concern, Saird maintains that the critic judge should evaluate the individual debater, and the decision would be determined by the team with the higher rating. 18

Argumentation and Debate.—A very popular volume of debate published by the Tau Kappa Alpha debate fraternity

---

17 Ibid.
18 Ibid.
was written by leading speech teachers of several American colleges and universities. David Potter edited the textbook, but Dallas C. Dickey of The University of Florida wrote a chapter on the judging of debates. In this chapter, Dickey refers to the important principles of sound argumentation found in the previous chapters of the textbook.

He explains that if debaters are expected to learn the basic principles and practice them, then the judge should use these principles when he judges the debate. This particular book was quite typical of most textbooks wherein the author gives reference to the previous chapters explaining that the principles taught should be the principles used and therefore judged. However, seldom do the authors relate to the student the inherent value that should be placed upon the specific principles taught.\footnote{Dallas C. Dickey, "The Judging of Debates," Argumentation and Debate, edited by David Potter (New York, 1954), p. 415.}

There were six basic areas of concentration listed which the judge should use in making his decision. The first area was the ability to analyze. He pointed out that one of the main reasons for debate is the training of the individual to examine and discover the best major arguments in any proposition. Therefore, it should be of vital importance for the judge to make certain conclusions regarding the relative skills of the debaters in analyzing the proposition for the basic issues to be debated. In
reality, all that is involved in the analysis of a debate question should and must become the concern of the judge as he observes the debate. 20

The second area of concern indicates that the judge should make certain observations on the organized debate cases as they are developed. By this statement, Dickey refers to the unity and coherence by which the debaters develop their lines of argument to the ultimate conclusions. The issues and arguments advanced, with the interpretations which are developed, constitute the stand or case that the debaters present. Organization, as it was more popularly used by other writers, is of great importance and should help determine the winner of the debate. Dickey clearly explains that the critic judge has the right to tell a debate team that he will insist on being able to record the organized speeches and positions of the teams. If he is not able to do so, he would consequently rate the other team higher in total debate. 21

The relative soundness of the argument presented is the third major area. Often debaters may state the issues quite clearly and demonstrate definite capability in analyzing the topic but fail to develop and defend those chosen issues in the selection of their arguments. This calls upon the student to develop a sense of logical reasoning and warns him

20 Ibid.
21 Ibid.
against many fallacies that may destroy his debate case. Arguments, therefore, help constitute the development and verification of the issues.  

22

The next concern of the judge deals with the evidence used in the debate. In the logical sequence, after analyzing the topic and then selecting arguments to be used, the debater must support those arguments with evidence. To prove the validity of any argument, the evidence introduced must satisfy the judge by its quantity and quality. The basic principles of evidence should be used by each debater and should be evaluated by the judge.  

23

Skill in refutation and rebuttal must also be evident within the presentations. Dickey points out that great debaters refute their opponents. When refuted, a debater must reply, thereby reconstructing his argument. This, in essence, is rebuttal. During the process of any debate, a team should attack the arguments, assumptions, and evidence of their opponents and therefore not limit themselves to the rebuttal speeches for refutation and rebuttal.  

24

Finally, the debater must be judged on his speaking ability. Agreeing with most writers, Dickey believes that debate is a form of public speaking, and it must follow the

22 Ibid.
23 Ibid., p. 416.
24 Ibid.
principles of effective persuasion. He even expresses that if everything else is equal, a judge will be entirely justified in deciding a debate on the basis of delivery alone. His basis for this area of concern is that debate often encourages certain poor speaking practices and habits. Therefore, the judge should be aware of both the good and the bad speaking characteristics of the four speakers. 25

This chapter on evaluation in the Tau Kappa Alpha textbook is in close agreement with many other textbooks surveyed—the basic philosophy being that the debate is won by the debate team who demonstrates the better debating. The better debating is determined by the team who is most competent in the six areas of major interest. There is no value placed on each standard and no implication that the six areas are of equal value or of unequal value. Dickey frequently states that, if all else is equal, the decision may be determined just on this one standard. 26

Recent Textbooks

Argumentation and Debate: Techniques of a Free Society. In their book, James H. McBurney and Glen E. Mills discuss the legislative vote for assemblies, where policy-determining debates occur, and the jurymen's vote, which is suited to fact not policy. However, the emphasis of the

25 Ibid.
26 Ibid.
book is on the third style of judgment, the critic's vote. The authors strongly indicate that the critic judge's sole responsibility is to determine and to indicate which team, in his opinion, did the more effective debating. The decision in favor of a team does not mean the judge agrees with the basic arguments or the position the winning team is defending, or even that he felt the team had the preponderance of evidence. It should simply be an evaluation on the total scope of educational debate and should reflect which team did the best total job of handling the situation. The textbook leans very heavily on the typical American Forensic Association debate ballot as a standard of judgment. The authors do not specifically state that quality rating should be applied to any of several criteria in a list of many categories. However, they do specify that of the areas used, the items should include some form of analysis and case, evidence, attack and defense, and delivery. 27 Though there is not a definite list of the areas which should be on the judge's ballot, there is the strong indication that the common items found on the American Forensic Association ballot must be included. It is interesting to note that by so arranging the comments on debate evaluation, McBurney and Mills have left open the possibility of using any other (and as many other) area(s)

as additional criteria for judgment. Therefore, if other items were to be added the total value placed on the particular debate would lower the value placed on analysis, evidence, attack and defense, and delivery.

In the earlier edition of the textbook, printed in 1951, James M. O'Neill of Brooklyn College assisted McBurney. This edition devoted little space to the evaluation process of a debate. The authors did, however, distinguish the basic difference between "criticism" and "judging." Only one paragraph explains the procedure for judging a contest debate. The critic is encouraged, in addition to writing either affirmative or negative on the ballot declaring the winner, to also use quality ratings. The criteria may vary in length and may cover many different areas but should cover analysis, evidence, attack and defense, and delivery. The one remaining paragraph is directed toward a type of ballot to be used. The most important aspect of this and most other early textbooks is the lack of emphasis or effort placed on the standard of judgment. In writing the later textbook, the authors must have realized a strong need to revise many aspects of argumentation and debate and to devote more consideration to evaluation. However, even in the new edition of the book, the section on evaluation is much more brief than the other new textbooks.

Argumentation and Debate.--In the textbook *Argumentation and Debate*, edited by James H. McEachan, Nicholas M. Cripe of Butler University writes an entire chapter on the evaluation of debate. The material, divided into two basic parts, explains the differences in the various ways of judging a debate. The first section deals with a minority group who would base its decision on factors seldom used by competent judges. The first mentioned is "the correct grammar school." The judge's one criterion in determining a winner is the consideration of good and correct grammar. If a speaker should mispronounce a word or split an infinitive or any of the other thousand possible mistakes, he is penalized. A decision of this type would most likely have to be determined by the team who made the least number of grammatical errors. Quite obviously, as the author points out, there are many other more important standards which should be placed above "good grammar" or at least should be included in the decision. The second of the minority groups bases its decision on "good delivery." A decision of this type expresses the primary belief that a debate is simply an exercise in public speaking. Even with the emphasis on public speaking, the greatest concern is based on how it is said rather than what is said. As Cripe points out, if debates were judged on delivery, then Abraham Lincoln could never have succeeded in winning a decision from Patrick
The third school of thought encompassed in this minority group is the "real life" or "convince me" idea. A judge of this type, sometimes without realizing it, forgets that he is listening to an educational debate and allows his personal beliefs and prejudices to affect his decision. He forgets that educational debate is not the settling of a question of policy or the changing of national affairs, but is simply the deciding of a winner based on the team's superior debating skill. It is apparent that the team which is fortunate enough to defend the side the judge favors has a relatively easy job, while the other team must construct in thirty minutes a case strong enough to change the judge's predetermined decision which may have developed over a period of several years.

A judge, explains Cripe, may often fall into one of the three categories in this minority group, but he should not be considered an expert debate judge. The majority group of judges acknowledges intercollegiate debate as an educational process, and the winner must be the team who demonstrates the better debating. In this "expert" group, there are two basic areas of judgment and each quite different from the other. These two areas may be called first the "issues" school and second the "skills" school. Both types of judges feel very strongly that to make a valid decision, one must

have a clearly defined standard for measuring each team. The difference between the two is the disagreement as to the particular standard of measurement. The first type believes that a debate decision must be based primarily on the issues presented in the debate.

They argue that it is the job of the affirmative team to prove the proposition to be probably true, and that the negative team must either disprove the proposition as being true or establish to the satisfaction of the judge that the affirmative has failed to prove its case. Since issues are those inherently vital points affirmed by the affirmative and denied by the negative, upon the establishment of which depends the establishment of the proposition, issues should be the ultimate criteria used in formulating a debate decision.

When judging on arguments presented, the decision is relatively simple to make. If the affirmative team is able to win the argument on each of the major issues of the debate, it is declared the winner. If, on the other hand, the negative team wins one of the arguments on a major issue or is able to present a case that creates sufficient doubt in the affirmative's case, the negative team is the announced winner.

The persons who would be considered in the "skills" school differ in their standard of measurement from that of the "issues" school. A judge believes that the major purpose

---

30 Ibid.
31 Ibid., p. 357.
32 Ibid.
of any debate team is a demonstration of superior performance in debate skill. Cripe refers to the article in *Speech Monographs* by Kim Giffin when he stated that "proponents of this view contend that the purpose of school debate is the training of its participants in the methods of sound debating, that becoming proficient in such aspects of debate as analysis, reasoning, the use of evidence, organization, refutation, and delivery is the ultimate goal of this activity." Therefore, according to this philosophy, a team could conceivably lose one or two major issues and still win the match because they demonstrated the better job of total debating. A judge in the "skills" school believes that the purpose of school debate is not for a team to convince the judge on the issues of a question but rather to train debaters in perfecting certain skills so that in real life situations the blending of these skills may achieve conviction. The ultimate test should not be whether the debaters have changed any opinions but instead the test should be on the amount of skill shown in the use of the process by which minds are changed.

The book elaborates on the skill technique by explaining a basic advantage. Since the decision is

---


34 Cripe, *op. cit.*, p. 359.
determined by the awarding of points to each of the various skills of each debater, it is much easier and much more accurate for the amateur judge to use this type procedure. The judge who is not familiar with collegiate debate can still make a value judgment simply by awarding points to the person for his particular skill in relationship to the other debaters. A second advantage discussed is that of the time involved. In any debate proposition, it is inevitable that one team has an advantage on certain issues: either the affirmative does not have sufficient time to present arguments thoroughly or the negative team does not have adequate time to refute the arguments presented. Therefore, a decision on the team who won the issues would by necessity place an unfair disadvantage on one team. The only fair method, because of the time element, is to rate the teams according to their comparative skills.  

Modern Debate.--One of the most extensive coverages of the debate judge is found in the textbook Modern Debate, Its Logic and Strategy by Arthur N. Kruger. The chapter on the debate judge is divided into several sections dealing with the general criteria for judging, the judge's qualifications, major problems in judging, factors to consider when judging, and major pitfalls of the judge.

The major emphasis of Kruger's book is concerned with the attack and defense on issues. Little material is devoted to the process of style, and his general approach to debate presentation indicates a lack of concern for this area. In determining the standard for making a decision, Kruger asserts clearly and certainly that the weighing of the clash on issues is the primary criterion. The judgment must be considered in terms of an end-means relationship. Therefore, the critic judge must decide first what the debater set out to do; and second, how successful he was in accomplishing his goals. For Kruger, the primary goal of the debater, from the affirmative standpoint, is to prove the debate resolution (to be probably true) and, from the negative standpoint, either to create doubt that the affirmative has proved the resolution or to disprove the resolution. He then substantiates his philosophy by saying that since among thinking men

...the only valid basis for believing that a proposition has been proved or disproved is the type of logical proof offered (and not such irrelevant factors as the manner or disposition of the speaker), the basic question for the judge to decide is: Did the affirmative prove the resolution (to be probably true)? If he decides yes, he is obliged to vote for the affirmative; if no, against the affirmative (and, of course for the negative). 36

Kruger's criteria for judging a debate are based on this concept.

36Kruger, op. cit., p. 362.
A second portion of the textbook deals with certain factors to consider when judging. This section is concerned with the unwritten rules of debate. The first consideration is a counterplan proposed by the negative. Kruger believes that any good negative will explain before the debate actually begins that a counterplan will be presented. If not, the negative must present the plan in the first negative constructive speech. To wait until the second speech is to have wasted two thirds of the affirmative speaking time presenting a need to change the status quo. Such a proposal obviously admits a need to change the status quo; the question simply is to which plan is the best solution credited. Next, he discusses the inclusion of all major issues and subissues in the constructive speeches. Naturally new material and evidence of the earlier proposed issues can be presented during the rebuttal period. A failure to comply to the set and unwritten rules would demand a decision by the judge to the opposite team.

In making the final decision, the judge should discount all assertions used as arguments. Also included in this area would be rhetorical questions which are in effect arguments by assertion. Next, Kruger strongly directs the judge to realize that an argument is considered standing until it is refuted by the opposition. However, at the conclusion of the debate, the judge must evaluate the various arguments and consider which side has reasoned more
effectively in regard to the various issues which have been introduced. In concluding the discussion of factors to be considered by judges, the author states that the judge should take into account such factors as analysis, knowledge, evidence, reasoning, organization, adaptation to opponents, language, delivery, and platform manner. It is important to realize that even though the last mentioned areas of concern are usually listed on all debate ballots, Kruger merely asserts that they should be taken into account. In fact, later in the chapter in discussing judging pitfalls, Kruger very thoroughly explains that a judge should not place a strong emphasis on delivery and other factors dealing only with speaking. In general, therefore, he considers the team doing the better debating is the team winning the arguments.

**Decision by Debate.**—In their textbook *Decision by Debate*, Ehninter and Brockriede recognize that tournament debate is not an end in itself, but rather a portion of the training of an individual. It is only natural that in the chapter devoted to the evaluation of debate, they are most concerned with the progress and development of the individual debater. This textbook, like several of the more recent ones, deals more extensively in the realm of debate decisions than those textbooks of the past. The chapter contrasts the various types of debate and continues to

---

37 Kruger, op. cit., p. 366.
explain that the educational style of debate is only beneficial to the debater when he has some sort of value judgment. The decision of a debate must fall into one of two basic categories. These two categories are the areas previously mentioned in the early controversy between James O'Neill and Hugh Wells. If college debating is viewed primarily as a game, the O'Neill position is appropriate. By instructing judges to determine which team is more skillful, one more nearly assures a fair contest. However, the two authors believe, more often than not, that debate has as its principal objective the training of debaters. Therefore, the juryman system of deciding in favor of the team that presented the preponderance of evidence and won the arguments becomes a more realistic system. Debating skills play their role in preparation and presentation, but participants know that their skills are not to be exhibited as an end product. Rather, they are to function as handmaidens to the clarity and forcefulness of their cases.  

Both Ehninger and Brockriede believe that a given debate will hinge on the arguments presented. Their preceding chapters imply that the decision in a debate is properly determined by the answers to two questions. The first question the judge must ask is, "Did the party bringing the challenge succeed in making out a prima facie
case on all of the issues?" The second question, "If so, did he successfully maintain a preponderance of proof on each of the issues his opponent chose to contest?" If the answer to both questions is "Yes," the decision belongs to the challenger. If the answer is "No," then the decision belongs to the party who denies the charge. Since these two questions decisively determine the success or failure of the contest, they are referred to as points of decision. The authors clearly state that upon these points of decision and upon no other point should the debate be determined.

Emphasis is placed upon the necessity for the debaters to remember that it is most important for the challenger to make a prima facie case. Of equal importance, the debate student must remember that even any narrow question, provided it is really an issue, is crucial to the debate as a whole. Therefore, even the smallest detail cannot be overlooked. The affirmative is not obligated to win every argument in the debate, nor does it even have the burden of gaining an edge on every contention. It must, however, gain assent on every issue.39

Even though the decision should be based on the arguments and contentions presented, the authors suggest that a rating system found on most ballots is helpful to students in improving their overall presentation.

39 Ibid., p. 339.
Argumentation and Debate.--A popular debate textbook is Austin J. Freeley's *Argumentation and Debate*. An entire chapter devoted to the evaluation of debate indicates that in order to contribute to the educational process, the judge must simply ask the one question: "Which team did the better debating?" In doing so, the judge must put away from him all aspects of the "rights" or "wrongs" of the question; he must forget any personal opinion that he may have; and he must overlook any and all factors that would otherwise color his decision. His purpose is to determine which is the better debate team. To answer this specific question, he must be guided by certain principles. First, he must apply his total knowledge of argumentation and debate. He must be able to use this knowledge to discriminate between good argumentation and that which is not good argumentation. By this concern, Freeley implies that he believes that debate should be judged for the most part by the arguments used. However, he does not specifically state which system employs the better criteria. His whole approach is broad and general, but he continually places emphasis in the direction of the issues presented.

Freeley's second concern is that the debate should be judged simply as it is presented. By this, he believes that only the material presented can be used for his evaluation;
he cannot allow himself to consider the undeveloped possibilities that a team overlooks. Since the debate must be judged only on the grounds of what is presented, the author of the textbook asserts that any statement made or any argument presented by either team stands until refuted by the other team. In addition, Freeley reflects the "issues" approach by concluding that a judge should weigh the relative strength and weakness of a debate case and then reflect his judgment in the quality rating system of the ballot.  

The final task of the judge to specifically determine the better debate team is to take comprehensive notes. Although one may not at first recognize the significance of this need, it is quite obvious that a recording of the arguments presented and the clash of the two teams on certain points would certainly emphasize argumentation. If a decision is based on several factors, it would not be as important to keep a complete record of the case presented. Freeley presents two systems of keeping track of the proposed issues and the record of the refutation and rebuttal of each team.  

Although Freeley does not specifically state the winner of the debate should be chosen on the arguments alone, it is implied that a decision of this type is of strong importance.

---

\(^{1}\) Ibid., p. 283.

\(^{2}\) Ibid., pp. 278-292.
At this point, it is again necessary to recognize how often the authors of textbooks in argumentation and debate do not take a firm stand relevant to the standards for judging a debate.

**Evaluation Standards of Modern Textbooks**

In each of the twelve books selected as most representative, a basic breakdown was made to simplify the particular criteria the authors chose to decide debates. An examination of the following chart reveals that the emphasis on the standard of judgment is very broad. First, the largest group of textbook authors firmly believes that the decision should be reached by weighing each of several aspects of debate. The general feeling is that equal value is to be placed on each area. A decision is to be determined by the simple addition of the value placed on each. The second basic category recognizes the necessity of debate standards but primarily decides the winner on the argumentation of the two teams. The following summary is a breakdown on judging a debate as found in the selected textbooks.

**Argumentation, Discussion, and Debate**, A. Craig Baird

- Definition and analysis
- Argument and evidence
- Evidence
- Structure
- Audience adaptation
- Language
- Refutation and rebuttal
- Delivery
- General effectiveness
Argumentation and Debate, David Potter, editor

Basic rules and principles of debate applied to judging

- Ability in analysis
- Observations on the organized debate cases as developed
- Relative soundness of the argument presented
- Use of evidence
- Skill in refutation and rebuttal
- Speaking ability of the debaters

Additional elements for the judge to consider
- Basic impressions
- Continuous decision
- Assessing penalties
- Explanation, not defense, of decision
- Educational implications

Oral Decision Making, Waldo Braden, Earnest Brandenburg

Analysis
Organization
Argument and supporting facts
Refutation
Language
Delivery
Attitudes
Overall effectiveness

Argumentation and Debate, James H. McBurney

Analysis and case
Attack and defense
Evidence
Delivery

Argumentation and Debate, James H. McBath, editor

Issues presented
- Affirmative must win each major issue
- Negative must present serious doubt in at least one major issue

Debate skills
- Analysis
- Reasoning
- Evidence
- Organization
- Refutation
- Delivery
Modern Debate, Arthur N. Kruger

Discount all assertions used as arguments
Arguments remain standing until refuted
Consider which team reasoned more effectively
Consider such factors as

- Analysis
- Knowledge
- Evidence
- Reasoning
- Organization
- Adaptation to opponents
- Language, delivery, and platform manner

Decision by Debate, Douglas Ehninger, Wayne Brockriede

Points for decision
The decision is properly determined by the answers to two questions:

(1) Did the party bringing the challenge succeed in making out a prima facie case on all of the issues?

(2) If so, did he successfully maintain a preponderance of proof on each of the issues his opponent chose to contest?

If the answer to both the above questions is "yes," the decision belongs to the challenger. If the answer to either or both of the questions is "no," the decision belongs to the party who denies the charge.

Argumentation and Debate, Austin J. Freeley

Evaluating the educational debate

(1) "Which team did the better debating?"
(2) Judged in the principles of argumentation.
Judgment on Debate Skills

It becomes very apparent that the old controversy between O'Neill and Wells still exists. Certainly, the majority of the authors of the surveyed textbooks agree that total debate technique is the best type of system to employ for an accurate judgment of the debate. Although there are several basic areas of judgment within the total approach, the preceding chart reveals a certain amount of agreement between the textbooks.

The following tabulated breakdown indicates the primary criteria used by the eight textbooks with a direct reference to judging.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Number of Textbooks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refutation and rebuttal</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasoning</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience adaptation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As previously mentioned, in the areas of analysis, evidence, refutation and rebuttal, delivery, organization,
and reasoning, the value of each standard is often the same. In each case, the judge would rate the achievement of each debate team in the specific areas. Thus, in a rating scale of one point for "superior" to five points for "fair" the judge would give a value to each area. The final decision would then be determined by simply adding the raw scores of each criterion, and the team receiving the lowest total score would win the debate. This score sheet style of judging on total debate technique has been in use for many years; and, despite its reliance on personal opinion, it can be of particular help to the judges who are not prepared to keep track of the arguments and refutations through to the conclusion of the debate. Therefore, the major advantage of this approach is the inherent ease in which the decision can be reached. To the tournament director who is not always able to procure the type of qualified judges he desires, he can recognize that a simple weighing of the two teams in light of predetermined standards will assure the most reliable decision. Let it not be forgotten that still the majority of debate coaches believe that the total debate technique is the method of really evaluating a debate. Therefore, the basic stand of O'Neill is still supported and definitely has merits to insure its continued use.

Judgment on Issues

The second general approach to the evaluation of debate is sometimes referred to as the double summary method. The
basic concept in this method recognizes that debate style and technique are important, but the decision as to the winner of the debate should be based on the team who made the best use of argumentation. Hugh M. Wells, leading the original controversy, believed that the judge should serve as a juryman and decide in favor of the team that presented the preponderance of evidence on the issues of the debate. This style requires that the judge keep extensive notes of all the material and arguments of each debater. Austin J. Freeley suggests that the judge be well informed in the art of argumentation and simply award the debate to the team which does the better debating.43

Of the eight textbooks with direct reference to evaluation, three of the books strongly support this approach and one book offers it as an alternative. However, it should be understood that many of the textbooks that support the total debate technique do maintain some reservations. Often in the listing of the several basic areas, the authors suggest that if evidence and reasoning were equal, the judge could decide the debate on delivery, or organization, or some other area. Certainly, the authors did not support the concept of arguments alone, but many did recognize the great importance it had in the debate.

43 Freeley, op. cit., p. 97.
A second interesting fact that has some strong insight in the argumentation approach is that the book *Argumentation and Debate* by Fregey emphasizes argumentation and is the top selling and most accepted debate textbook in colleges today. In addition, other new textbooks in the field have strongly supported this approach. Therefore, it appears that even though the mass numbers of books lean toward the concept of total debate judging, the followers of the argumentation school have certainly occupied a strong position in debate education. One recognizes immediately that this technique requires an alert judge; but if he does his job, the decision is sound and objective, with a minimum of reliance on personal opinion. It requires a judge to apply his total knowledge of argumentation. He must be able to listen to the entire debate and finally reach his decision on his knowledge of argumentation. Second, he must set aside his special knowledge of the subject for the duration of the debate. As a judge, it is natural that often he is more informed in the area of the proposition than the debaters. Third, he should base his decision on the debate as it is presented. The interested judge does not let his personal opinion or knowledge in any way affect his decision. If his sole criteria is concerned with which team did the better arguing, he will not be tempted to involve himself in the decision. Finally, it is suggested that the trained judge should take good notes throughout the entire
debate. Only when he has transcribed the arguments of each team onto his note pad can he actually see which team answered the other's arguments and which team's case survives the rebuttal of the other team.

The total debate technique is highly suitable, particularly when the judge may not be fully trained in argumentation and debate. It provides an opportunity to compare the two teams and to weigh one against the other in deciding the winner. On the other side of the controversy, judgment on argumentation alone is perhaps the best method of keeping quality rating to a minimum. As a result, the judge relies on the actual refutation of each team in determining his decision. If the main purpose of debate is to train the student in argumentation, then it is only logical that the evaluation be based on his arguments. The training of critical thinking could be much stronger if the student knew that the judge's main criterion of evaluating is the student's use of arguments.

The original controversy between O'Neill and Wells will no doubt continue. However, the interest in the means and standards of judgment will cause debaters and coaches alike to reevaluate their understanding of judging a debate. Perhaps in the future the emphasis will be drawn closer and closer until all concerned can agree how educational debate should be judged to determine the winner.

\[\text{Freeley, op. cit., pp. 283-285.}\]
Debate Rules

With the emphasis upon who should serve as contest judges and upon what standard should the decision be made, there has been a lack of new material written concerning the rules and techniques of competition debate. The main reason for the lack of emphasis in this area of rule making is the highly acceptable book written by George McCoy Musgrave, *Competitive Debate*. This textbook has been long recognized as the rules for proper college debate. Therefore, to gain a complete knowledge of the emphasis on judging one must examine the rules established by Musgrave.

Rule number nine of Musgrave's book deals directly with the judging of a debate. One basic principle underlies debate judging.

**Rule 9a** The team doing the better debating is the winner. 45

The reader of any debate textbook immediately recognizes this expression but must then ask the question, "What is meant by better debating?" Since there are several conceivable methods of arriving at who did the better debating, Musgrave continues:

**Rule 9c** The decision is given to the affirmative if it succeeds in showing that the proposed plan should be adopted. The decision is given to the negative if the affirmative fails to show that the proposal should be adopted. 46

46 Ibid., p. 32.
Quite clearly the Rule 9c requires the judge to base his decision on the winning of arguments which will show the need to adopt or to reject the proposal depending on the side winning the argument. The important aspect is that the entire emphasis is placed on the winning of the team's case, and not on the level of debating skill that was demonstrated. A decision of this type would certainly be determined on the arguments presented and the continuation of the rules were designed to assist the judge in deciding who won the various arguments.

Rule 9d The judge must base his decision entirely on the material presented, without regard for other material which he may happen to possess. 47

The arguments or evidence which might be recognized by the judge but which was not presented during the debate should in no way affect the decision. Additional information concerning the establishment of an argument is covered in the following rules.

Rule 9e The judge is required to accept as true all arguments backed by reasonable proof (as defined above) until such arguments are overthrown by the opposing team. 48

A judge is not permitted to consider a point weak unless the opposing team refutes and proves that it is weak or unless the team originating the point fails to satisfactorily support the assertions.

47 Ibid.
48 Ibid.
Rule Of The judge must not accept ideas which are not backed by reasonable proof. 49

In all the material devoted to the judging of debate, the emphasis is on the team doing the "better debating." The subsequent rules provide the opportunity to determine the value of an argument and the establishing of such arguments. If the affirmative is able to prove its case for adoption of the proposal, then on this one reason (nothing else is listed in the rules) the decision is granted to the affirmative. If the affirmative fails to establish that its proposal should be adopted, then because of losing the arguments, the decision shall go to the negative.

The latter portion of the book of debate rules is devoted to the explanation and the expansion of the debate rules into usable material. Musgrave in this section recognizes that often "the better debating" is determined by means of a score sheet. Therefore, he establishes certain principles by which such a system can be used. The score sheet method of judging should consist of:

1. Preparing a list of the elements of effective debating;
2. Assigning an arbitrary weight or value to each;
3. Rating each team (or each speaker) on each element;
4. Totaling the points and awarding the decision to the team with the highest total. 50

Ibid.

Ibid., p. 95.
An example of such a system was that used in *Speech Activities*, Spring, 1953.

Skill in analysis. . . . .10 to 20 points per speaker
Adequacy of organization. . Same
Knowledge of subject. . . Same
Presentation of evidence. . Same
Use of reasoning. . . . . . Same
Refutation and rebuttal. . . . Same
Style of presentation. . . . Same
Ethical consideration. . . . Same

Total 51

The use of this type of ballot was discussed in the next chapter. The major comment by Musgrave to this type judgment was that "the score sheet technique has been in use for many years and, despite its reliance on personal opinion, it can be of help, particularly in the case of judges who are not prepared to keep track of the arguments and their refutation through to the conclusion of the debate." Therefore, from the above quotation it is obvious that Musgrave does not generally approve of the score sheet method for determining a debate. Instead, he suggests that the second method be used.

The double summary method is a procedure to keep track of the arguments presented by both teams and then awarding the team that did the better debating (won the arguments). The judging procedure consists of:


1. Recording the advantages brought out by the affirmative;

2. Recording the disadvantages brought out by the negative;

3. Recording the refutation and the counter-refutation;

4. Determining which advantages and disadvantages remain standing at the end of the debate; and

5. Awarding the decision to the team which succeeds in doing what the proposition requires. 53

A simple chart that the judge could use to help determine the debate is provided. At the end of the debate, the judge begins his task by analyzing his notes on the arguments presented by each team. He considers only the arguments which remain standing at the end of the debate, and those for which satisfactory refutation has not been offered, or which were rebuilt satisfactorily after refutation. 54 He then uses the following system to determine the winner:

A. In status quo debates:

1. The plan is shown by the teams to have some advantages and no disadvantages at all:
   Decision: Affirmative

2. The plan is shown to have no advantages of any kind:
   Decision: Negative

3. The plan is shown to have both advantages and disadvantages:
   Decision: Either team, depending on (1) the demonstrated importance of the advantages and disadvantages, and (2) the quantity.

53 Ibid., p. 97.

54 Ibid., pp. 104-105.
B. In counterplan debates:

1. The counterplan is shown to have advantages and no disadvantages with respect to the affirmative proposal:
   Decision: Negative

2. The counterplan is shown to have no advantages with respect to the affirmative proposal:
   Decision: Affirmative

3. The counterplan is shown to have both advantages and disadvantages with respect to the affirmative proposal:
   Decision: Either team, depending on
   (1) the demonstrated importance of the established advantages and the disadvantages and (2) the quantity.55

The above chart can be very helpful to the judge who is familiar with the double summary method of determining a contest debate. This system relies entirely on arguments presented and in no way upon the skill of the debater in the areas of debate skill. Musgrave concludes by saying that "it will be recognized at once that this technique requires an alert judge, but if he does his job, the decision is sound and objective, with a minimum of reliance on personal opinion."56

Since the two methods of judging are recognized and encouraged by debate leaders, there may always be disagreement as to the correct method of judging. However, to help clarify the major difference, the following breakdown is a contrast of the two systems.

55Ibid.
56Ibid., p. 105.
**SCORE SHEET METHOD**

**Advantages**
1. The system is easy to learn. Just about anyone can say, "I think I'll give that man 3 on reasoning."

2. It gives the judge some idea of relative strengths, at least more of an idea than he would have without some system.

**Disadvantages**
1. The decision may go to the wrong team. Too much reliance is placed on arbitrary lists and points with little meaning.

2. No consideration is given to the fact that some elements may be more important than others in a given debate.

3. It is undesirable to teach debaters to emphasize elements for their own sake, when they should be looked upon as incidental means to an end.

**DOUBLE SUMMARY METHOD**

**Advantages**
1. It gives an objective answer, based on accomplishment.

**Disadvantages**
1. It requires a judge who knows his job, and who is alert. 57

Chapter Summary

In reviewing the popular textbooks on argumentation and debate, the basic difference recognized by O'Neill and Wells

still exists. The majority of the textbooks agree with O'Neill that the emphasis should be placed on total debate skill. They feel that the actual debate is unimportant because the college is only attempting to teach the techniques of argumentation and persuasion. Often a side would consistently win if arguments were the only criteria because of the evidence available on a particular topic. Therefore, the question is only a vehicle by which the four debaters demonstrate the quality of their debate skill. A judge awards his decision by giving a rating to each speaker in each of several categories. He then totals the ratings and awards the decision to the team with the higher score.

The current debate textbooks by Kruger, Freeley, and Ehninger and Brockriede, and the book on debate rules support the views of Wells by proposing that the team winning the arguments wins the debate. In this style, the judge keeps record of the arguments presented, the refutation offered by each team in attack of these arguments, and finally, the rebuttal of the two teams. By examining the arguments that remain standing after the debate has concluded, the judge awards the debate to the team winning the arguments presented. A decision on this basis is determined primarily on the analysis, argumentation, refutation, and rebuttal of each team. The decision is also a result of a team effort and not the high rating of one individual.
CHAPTER III

THE THEORETICAL CRITERIA FOR DETERMINING
DEBATE--A SURVEY OF LITERATURE

To appreciate the problems of debate judging from half a century ago until the present time, it is necessary to survey articles written in speech journals and other related periodicals. Although the number of articles dealing directly with standards for judgment were few, those that were available reflect positions and opinions of those in the forensic field. The shortage of published material indicates either a lack of need for a more complete coverage, or an unrecognized need to explore the field of developing a unity among all debate judges. By surveying the articles directly dealing with debate judging, it was possible to better recognize the theoretical approach to judging.

Nearly fifty years ago, Lew Sarett, a great teacher in the field of speech, set forth a certain unity of criteria theretofore lacking in debate evaluation. He suggested a plan for debate judges to follow in analyzing a debate and arriving at a decision. The set of questions, if used, would tend to unify the judging standards and quality ratings of all critic judges. It would assure the student debaters
that their presentation would be considered thoroughly and
that a complete approach would be used to determine the
winner.

Lew Sarett suggested that during the debate the judge
should have before him a set of questions for which he
would be seeking the answers. They would serve as a guide in
directing his thinking and finally in determining his
decision. The following list constitutes the eleven questions
which were designed by Sarett.¹

1. Which team was superior in the clear, coherent,
and effective organization of its material?

2. Which team better supported its contentions
with sound proof?

3. Which team established and maintained the
most crucial issues?

4. Which team was superior in destroying its
opponent's crucial issues?

5. Which team, through greater freedom in
departing from prepared speeches, and through
superior extempore speaking and resource-
fulness, more readily adapted its arguments
to the arguments actually made by its
opponents upon the platform?

6. Which team in its constructive argument
manifested a superior analysis of the
question?

7. Which team manifested a superior analysis of
the debate as it actually progressed on the
platform; that is, which team was superior
in discovering and following the strategic
issues rather than the minor or irrelevant
points?

¹Lew R. Sarett, "The Expert Judge of Debate," The
Quarterly Journal of Public Speaking, III (April, 1917),
137-138.
8. Which team was superior in team work?

9. Which team was superior in delivery, aside from the effective delivery presumed in other questions?

10. Which team in general—aside from the rebuttal work presumed in other questions—was superior in rebuttal?

11. Which team was superior in debate strategy?

The questions alone do not equate the specific standard for judgment. They do, however, simplify debate into the specific factors to be evaluated. As Nicholas M. Cripe said, "While it is obvious that these questions are not mutually exclusive, it seems that this or a similar set of questions could bring to the judging of school debating a clarity, a thoroughness of analysis, and a unity of criteria that was lacking when Saret first offered them and that frequently is lacking today.”

Who Should Judge a Debate

Joseph A. Wigley believes that debate coaches should not judge a debate because their judgments often become artificial. He states that a "debate coach can become enamored of techniques which he remembers as having succeeded for himself at some time in the misty past, rather than a real concern as to what was really stated by each.

---

2Ibid.

team." On the other extreme is the impressionable audience that is swayed by insignificant aspects of the debate. They do not base their decision on the important elements of debate, but rather on which team captured public feeling. In between these two, Wigley believes, is the true critic judge of debate: he is a person who knows international affairs; he is a thinking man; he gives little value to debate technique. If the debater wants to win the debate he must sell the critic judge on his case by presenting it in an orderly, intelligible fashion. To serve as an example, Wigley relates a current situation.

In a debate I judged recently my vote went to the affirmative, who presented a lucid, logical argument, simple in conception, backed with undeniable facts. The negative team spoke so much more rapidly that they must have presented twice as many statements, of which five were, to my personal knowledge, false. Although I was the official judge, members of the audience, experienced debaters, were also asked to give a verdict. With only one or two exceptions they voted for the negative, which, with their rapid patter and embarrassing vehemence, conformed more nearly to the audience's concept of "skilled debaters"! "They had the techniques," one member of the audience said afterwards.  

First, debate coaches must recognize their ethical obligations to discourage sophistry; and second, they must not assume that persuasion is only for an audience of rhetoricians. A debater must be able to relate all that he

5 Ibid.
says to his audience whomever they might be. Wigley said that "debate which develops the skill of persuading only debate coaches is surely an activity in a vacuum." He believes that the ideal judge is neither the neutral debate coach nor the mass audience, but the expert in the subject area. Wigley believes that the selection of an expert judge depends upon the debate question, but he would likely be the teacher of political science, economics, or history, or any well-informed layman. The critic judge is a reasonable, thoughtful, and fair individual who is influenced only by the quality of facts and evidence presented as well as by the honesty of the speaker.

Improving Debate Judging

The quality of a judge has always been of central interest in writing about debate judgment. The blame for a poor decision is most often placed on the shoulders of the person who accepted the services of an unqualified judge. In most tournaments, there are usually persons who fail to meet a minimum standard of debate experience. This fact was strongly stressed by Dorothy Garrett Melzer when she said, "With all of our capable judges today, we have still too many of the incompetent, the unethical, the harsh, and the inefficient. Add to this picture the confusion arising from

6Ibid.
all the varied concepts of debate plus our individual ideas of the way in which the particular question should be handled."^7

After qualifying a capable judge, Melzer explains that tournament judging can also be improved by making certain changes within the contest. Three suggestions that she recommends are:

1. Aids to efficient judging should be provided by the tournament director.
2. Uniform criteria for judging should be established before the tournament begins.
3. The ballot should encourage a decision based on clash. 8

Melzer's first precaution suggests that the tournament director should make it easy for his judges to give an efficient performance. A pencil, paper, and a time keeper should be provided. This forethought gives certain freedom for the judge by not demanding extra effort on his part. The second suggestion presented would be to arrange a meeting of all the judges prior to the beginning of the debates to outline the specific criteria that should be used to determine the winners of the several debates. It is desirable to establish this unity in judging in order to prevent the use of so many varied standards of value, thereby affecting the validity of the outcome of the tournament.

8 Ibid.
If it is not possible to reach an agreement among the judges, it is possible to help the debaters as was proven in an experiment at the University of Colorado. In this particular situation, a critic symposium was organized so that each judge could present a two-minute explanation of what he considered to be good debating. A slightly modified plan was conducted at the University of Mississippi during the Southern Region of Tau Kappa Alpha convention. "Five of the visiting coach-judges gave four-minute talks on their opinions of certain debate problems relating to the national question. A panel of twelve students, representing each participating school, then had the opportunity to ask the coaches any questions concerning debate techniques on the current proposition." The symposium provided a stimulating experience for both the students and the judges of the tournament.

On the other hand, it might be less confusing if each one of us (judges) said before the debate what we did and did not like in debate rather than saving this for the end of the debate so that the debaters might adapt to our ideas just in time to antagonize the next judge, who might believe the exact opposite. We may all have had this happen; it is most discouraging and upsetting to new debaters. Experienced debaters soon pay no attention to these criticisms.

To reveal to the debaters the basic standards by which the debate will be judged is of utmost importance. Some

10 Melzer, op. cit., p. 48.
relationship between the debate presented and the standards judged should at least be attempted.

The third suggestion by Helzer is that each judge's ballot should encourage a decision on "clash." She does not approve of the typical breakdown of debate skills usually found on the ballot. Instead of the normal analysis and case, evidence, attack and defense, and delivery areas found on most ballots, she suggests simply to provide a place to award the decision. In this way, the judge does not have to assign grades for each section and add them to determine the winner; he can listen to the debate and decide by the clash of arguments who won the contest and award the decision accordingly. The judge should then be asked to rate the debate team by a score of 5 for excellent, 3 for good, 1 for fair, and nothing for poor. This allows the judge to take all factors into consideration in rating the debaters without breaking down the debate itself into a weighing of grades. As Melzer points out, the director of the tournament discovers from the ballots which team was the best in argumentation and he has available a rating scale on the overall quality of each team. The main advantage of this procedure is that the judge can determine the winner on clash of arguments and not on the value of certain skills.

The Debate Judge As a Machine

Dale Drum proposes a new area of concern when he states that a debate judge is only a machine. Present debate
standards require a judge to keep record of certain points as they are made until, in reality, he is a mere computer, analyst, or manipulator. This occurs because the judge is required to take notes on all that is said and record it, much like a machine, with little concern as to how it is stated. Then the judge weighs the evidence of both teams and decides which team wins the debate. Drum believes that debaters should speak in a normal manner rather than as to a court stenographer; the debaters should communicate in the fullest sense to the judge, who in turn should simply listen and decide the winner of the debate. As a typical example he explains,

Consider for a moment what actually happens in the usual debate. Five people enter a room: four debaters and one judge; there may be an unhappy "draftee" for timekeeper, and all concentrating their attention and efforts on a single person, the judge. As each speaker's turn arrives he speaks forcefully, not so much because he feels forceful, but because (1) he is excited, (2) he knows this is expected of a winning debater, or (3) he doesn't know any other way to present a case. He usually speaks carefully and deliberately, making sure as he does so that the judge has plenty of time to write down all that is being said. He speaks in the clearest and most easily copied concepts, again so that the judge's pen may not miss a syllable. And, finally, he makes sure that he is well bolstered by small white cards which give many and varied "facts" assiduously copied from some authority, because he knows that it is the accumulated weight of the subject which will weigh most heavily with the judge.

12 Ibid., p. 30.
With this example, Drum authenticates his belief of how mechanical the judge and the debaters usually become because of the method that is imposed upon them. The American collegiate debater soon becomes trained to recognize the judge as a machine. Drum points out that many so-called authorities propose that the "perfect judge" is "...like the mechanical computer; the judge is supposed to have no emotions, no biases, no feelings on the matter, and, in fact, no memory." 13

Drum believes that the importance should not be on what the debater says, but rather on how well he succeeds in winning over his audience. The persuasiveness of the speaker is of far greater importance than any other one aspect. He feels that debate should bring the speakers into a speaker-audience situation instead of a speaker-judge arrangement. The debaters' training should be centered in learning to sway an entire audience because in life, it is people who are persuaded, not judges who record information and calculate the winner of certain arguments.

In direct opposition to Drum, Arthur N. Kruger firmly believes that present debate does not make a machine of a judge, but rather causes him to evaluate the total debate. Kruger "considers debating above all a contest in thinking, an attempt to get at the truth by logical analysis and by reasonable inferences based upon sound evidence. What

13 Ibid.
matters how well a person speaks on winning his personality if he says little or nothing. From Kruger's point of view, the debate judge should be above all a critical thinker if he is to qualify for adequately evaluating a debate.

This difference of opinion accounts for a part of the gap between the bases for awarding decisions. These differences need to be more unified to standardize the judge's concept of value. "If being persuasive means winning an audience by non-rational means—which I will admit seems to be the most effective way of winning an audience in our country—I say it is about time that the people were made aware of the fraud perpetrated upon them and time we stopped encouraging students to carry on the hoax." Kruger believes that it is far more important for us to make decisions based upon facts rather than just upon the cleverness of a speaker and the persuasiveness of his voice. For this reason the debate judge must be a critical thinker and must properly guide the students to engage in an analytical debate.

If the judge has a superhuman memory, it may not be necessary for him to keep notes as the debate progresses; however, most judges feel that it is mandatory to use notes in deciding the better refutation and rebuttal of arguments.


15 Ibid.
Of what value is it for the students to develop arguments when it is likely that the judge will base his decision on meaningful inflections, speaker cleverness, or platform personality. Arthur Kruger asks the question,

Who can blame them for becoming somewhat cynical and deserting an activity into which they have put so much time and effort to preparing reasonable arguments when they are judged so often by those who are patently incompetent to judge them? It would be better if those whose interests lie primarily in speech activity and delivery, who consider debating a distasteful chore, would withdraw from debate and leave the field to those who regard debate as an intellectual activity, who relish and value logic and a systematic inquiry into the truth, who recognize this activity for what it really is: the most efficacious way of reaching conclusions and trying to solve problems in a democracy. 16

These two articles explain the two opposite philosophies of Drum and Kruger. Each author feels strongly about the role of the debate judge during the exchange of arguments; yet these two men are only representative of the differences of writers on debate.

In an article, Aloysius A. Norton writes about the problems of his debating teams. Referring to several tournaments that he had recently attended, he commented on the different situations that continually presented themselves to his students and were a constant thorn in his philosophy of debate. He believes that "public speaking techniques mean nothing in current debating. Personality means nothing.

16 Ibid., p. 31
Persuasion means less."¹⁷ Norton feels that the modern evolution of debate has developed into an impossible activity. The habits of the successful speaker reflect not the true picture of argumentation, but that of high-pressure salesmen. "American debating can without a doubt provide an endless supply of high-pressure salesmen. They say very little because they concentrate on confusing the opposition, or catching them off guard, with some obscure approach to the national topic."¹⁸ Part of the role of the modern speaker is to carry at all times valises loaded with material to use against the opposition. Norton feels that the use of logical reasoning is lost from argumentation. A team will try almost anything, but will never resort to the use of reasoning to prove a point. He warns that the next step is automation within a debate tournament. Each team will simply place its notecards in the appropriate end of the machine which will digest the material and award the decision to the team who had the bulk of evidence. Speaking ability, analysis, or argumentation would have no part in the decision.¹⁹ This article again expresses a distance between the views of the coaches of debate.

¹⁷Aloysius A. Norton, "Opinion and Comment," American Forensic Association Register, IX (Spring, 1961), 27.
¹⁸Ibid.
¹⁹Ibid.
Chapter Summary

An important aspect in the survey of articles discussed is the obvious lack of material available on the improvement of debate judging. A writer simply attacks the judge who disagrees with his particular point of view.

The surveyed articles are representative of the types of material that are written in the speech journals. The articles fall into one of two divisions: either the emphasis should be placed on the student as a speaker and his ability to persuade and relate his material directly to an audience; or emphasis should be on the development of the debater's entire speech around the stronger use of evidence and logic. So the battle between the "skills" school and the "issues" school continues. It becomes quite obvious that the field is divided and it is not possible to determine by the few articles written what portion of the writers could be classified in either of the two schools of thought relative to debate judging.
CHAPTER IV

THE THEORETICAL CRITERIA FOR DETERMINING

DECISION DEBATE--THE BALLOT

If it is necessary for a debate judge to use established criteria for determining the winner of a competition debate, then it is also necessary that he have a vehicle to reflect that decision. The debate ballot should serve that special purpose. The ballot should never be considered a substitute for a judge's lack of knowledge nor should it interfere with his decision. The ballot should be used only to reflect the judge's decision.

A good ballot should assist the judge and simplify the task in making his final decision of the debate. Often a relatively poor ballot not only fails to help the judge but complicates or interferes with his evaluation task. The tournament director, therefore, must always be very conscious of the relationship of the debate ballot to the critic judge; he should seek to adopt the specific ballot that will best serve the demands of an educational debate. For a long while the problem of locating or discovering a good ballot has been the responsibility of forensic leaders.
Throughout the history of debate, there has been a direct relationship between the indecision as to the perfect ballot and the problem of isolating the proper criteria for making the decision. Since judges could not agree on the correct basis of evaluating a debate, they could not agree on the proper ballot to reflect that decision. Many attempts have been made and the variety ranges from the very simple ballot stating only the winner to a very elaborate system extensively involving the judge in answering questions on almost every aspect of the debate.

Purpose of the Ballot

The true purpose of the ballot is a strong point of controversy. The clash of ideas is based on two basic schools of thought concerning the debate decision. Those persons who support the "skills" school, believing that a debate is judged on the skill with which the debate is presented, think the ballot is the major factor in determining the decision. Accordingly, the ballot would contain the various elements that the judge uses to decide the winner. The nearer the ballot comes to listing the specific areas of evaluation chosen by the judge, the better the ballot. If the areas are listed exactly as the judge lists them, then the ballot not only reflects his decision, but in essence it guides his decision.

The purpose of the ballot for those leaders in the "skills" school is very clear. The ballot must be
constructed to list each of the areas by which the debate must be judged. The only complication for them is in the determination of which specific criteria should be selected. Since debate coaches and authors of debate textbooks, as already discussed, cannot agree on the most important specific skills to be included in the decision, the ballot has never been standardized. The important point is that the "skills" school considers the ballot an integral part of the decision if not the only element that serves as the criterion for deciding the debate.

Contrasting this view, the members of the "issues" school recognize the purpose of the ballot quite differently. Since the debate must be decided upon the issues presented and refuted, the ballot must in no way decide the winner of the debate. The ballot must serve only to reflect the decision made by the judge, independent of the material listed on the ballot. The only important aspect of the ballot would be a place to list the winner and a place to comment on the debate. However, even though the primary purpose of the ballot is to show the decision, the "skills" school recognizes a second advantage in listing areas other than argumentation. Since the basic function of the ballot is to reflect, not decide, the decision, the "issues" school would have comparatively little difficulty deciding on a good ballot. The major criterion is the reflection of the decision; the complication exists in a difference of
opinion as to how the decision can best be reflected in the ballot.

Skill Areas

In an earlier chapter, it was discovered that most debate textbooks preferred the total skills approach to serve as the main criterion for determining a decision debate. The skills system usually involves listing several fundamental areas of debate technique considered the most important qualities of a good debater. Each textbook on argumentation preferring the skills approach gave a brief definition of the meaning of the different areas selected. Though some attention has been given to the definition of each in the review of the popular debate textbooks, it is necessary that a much more thorough analysis be given to each area used on most of the current debate ballots.

The skill areas found on the popular American Forensic Association ballot are analysis, reasoning and evidence, organization, refutation, and delivery. Each of these areas was of primary interest. In addition, the areas of style, case, argumentation, communicativeness, and teamwork were also defined since these areas are often found on ballots used in tournament competition.

It must be recognized from the outset of the breakdown and definition of the above areas that there is a great deal of overlapping of meaning in the various terms employed. Therefore, on one certain ballot one division may include
that material used in two separate areas of a second ballot. Each area is defined, and cross reference to other inclusive areas is mentioned.

**Analysis**

Arthur N. Kruger defines analysis as the process of "picking out and developing the important issues and sub-issues of the particular debate proposition. Here the judge must consider the significance of the particular issues chosen."¹ If a debater is to demonstrate a certain degree of competence in argumentation and debate, he must evince skill in his ability to analyze the proposition. He must be able to separate the important from the unimportant aspects of the question and to become deeply involved in the critical issues of the debate. His capability in getting to the crux of the topic in question is a prerequisite to the debate itself.

Each team must demonstrate a certain degree of competence in the selection of "clash" points. A debater should be capable of remaining on the main issues and not be distracted by minor or irrelevant points. In awarding the quality points to each speaker, the critic judge must weigh the contentions and arguments of each team. Essentially, analysis may simply be understood as expressed by Kruger. "Analysis may be described as the process of breaking down an entity into its component parts and examining the

---

relationships among them." Accordingly, analysis of a debate resolution may be described as the process of determining the main points of arguments which, when developed, "prove" the truth or falsity of the resolution.

Evidence

In the everyday world, people continually make assertions without definite proof. Fortunately, there are certain people who will not accept ideas only on this basis because of their previous knowledge. To convince this group, the individual must develop arguments with strength. Such supporting material as this usually is classified as evidence.

Evidence consists of related facts, personal opinion, and information concerning the subject that can be used to develop proof of a certain point. It is the raw material from which the finished product, proof, is made by the process of reasoning. Evidence, differing from reasoning, is the other ingredient of proof; evidence is independent of and external to the advocate.

In other words, the advocate finds evidence but develops the reasoning. Evidence and reasoning are quite different areas, but together they compose proof to substantiate an argument.

The misconception of truth by some persons leads them to think that before anything in life can be accepted as truth, it must be sufficiently proven. This cannot always be

2 Ibid., p. 365.

the situation in that material is not always available to
document the ideas expressed. To help clarify the need of
evidence, Bernard Baruch says, "Every man has a right to his
opinion, but no man has a right to be wrong in his facts." When material evidence is available, a person should feel an
obligation to base ideas on the facts.

This does not mean, however, that a person who is
speaking with the purpose of persuasion must prove with
strong evidence every statement he presents. There are
some inferences that would prove too involved if a speaker
were forced to develop each idea with strong proof. The
listener must evaluate for himself the arguments used and
ideas presented in order to determine which of the inferences
must be supported and to what degree. This decision is
necessary because the doctrine of judicial notice holds that
there are certain facts and judgments which are so well known
or so easily verified that to require evidence of them would
be a waste of time. Therefore, it is only natural that a
speaker would in the process of proving a point be required
to follow only the principles expected by legal argumentation.

The critic judge with an understanding of the meaning of
evidence and the importance it plays in a debate must be able
to evaluate it. This common practice is referred to as the
"test of evidence." The judge is expected to determine if a

\[^{4}\text{Ibid.}, \text{p. 92.}\]
\[^{5}\text{Ibid.}, \text{p. 93.}\]
team has presented the kind and amount of evidence required to effectively convince and persuade its audience. The critic compares the evidence of one team against that of the other team to determine which pair did the better debating. From the presentation the judge must decide if the proof used by each speaker was actually strong or weak in reference to the debate. Upon this basis, suitability of evidence presented, the quality points are awarded to the speaker.

**Reasoning**

Although separate in the breakdown of the skill areas, reasoning is often encompassed in another area. Basically, however, reasoning is a separate area involving the drawing of conclusions from evidence presented. This difference is not always recognized to the extent that it is a separate area on the ballot. Not all textbooks of argumentation devote a separate chapter to reasoning per se. Instead, the explanation of reasoning may occur in the same chapter as that dealing directly with evidence or in a special chapter in the development of an argument. The term argument often serves as a synonym for reasoning.

The critic has the task of evaluating the debaters' skill in light of other debates heard and awarding quality points to that particular team. He should examine the structural soundness of the argument presented by both the affirmative and the negative teams. The organized case
should be developed in such a way that the reasoning presented leads to the conclusion reached by the team. The critic must test the validity of the reasoning used by each member. The debater should not be guilty of making generalizations without sufficient evidence to substantiate his arguments. If analogies were used the critic must determine if they were valid comparisons between two related subjects, leading to a logical conclusion.

Finally, the judge must decide if the debaters were guilty of obvious fallacies and/or some form of unfair tactics by their use of arguments. A fallacy is improper reasoning that does not naturally lead to the conclusion presented by the debater. The information may not imply the meaning derived by the speaker or he may be guilty of making large jumps from one idea to another without proper development of the argument. Unfair tactics are sometimes displayed when the opposing team misconstrues an argument of its opponent thus gaining an unfair advantage. Debaters may use devices such as begging a question, extending an argument, arguing in a circle, or avoiding arguments to strengthen their case. In such a situation the judge must be able to evaluate and determine the reasoning ability of the individual speakers. The major task of the speaker is denoted in McBurney's and Mills' textbook.

The problem is one of giving the evidence and argument (reasoning) of the speaker a context and structure which will recommend his
proposition to the listener; it is a matter of expressing in language the grounds from which another can reason to the conclusion upheld by the advocate. Awarding points in a manner to reflect the ability of the speaker is the task of the critic judge in the area of reasoning. 6

Organization

Since the debater is required to use evidence and develop sound reasoning, it is obvious that he should present his arguments in the most effective manner. The value of the arguments used may often be determined by the order in which they are presented. "For if you do not understand a chain of arguments thoroughly, if you are hesitant or hasty about where this contention or that bit of evidence fits in on the assembly line of cogent ideas, you will fail to produce a competitive or defensible argument." 7

The quality of a team can partially be determined by deciding the speaker's ability to organize. In evaluating the capabilities of each team member, the judge can use three basic criteria to determine the degree of success achieved in organization. They are:

1. To insure logical relationships between points,
2. To determine proper emphasis of arguments, and
3. To insure against omission of significant arguments or evidence. 8


8 Ibid., p. 89.
Knowing the purposes of organization, the judge listens to determine how effectively the speaker achieved his goal of communication. The judge should be aware of basic divisions within each speech emphasizing major points of the case. He should evaluate the use of internal and external summaries within each speech. He should detect smooth transition between each major point.

The judge should evaluate the debater in his use of strong organization that assists rather than deters the presentation of the team's case. He must decide if each speaker presented his arguments in a clear, concise manner, producing a case easily comprehended by debaters and listeners alike.

Refutation

"Whenever two opposing cases on a given issue fail to meet, the listeners or readers tend to discredit both cases. The argumentative processes of attack and defense (with evidence, assumptions, and logical reasoning) determine whether an argument is finally accepted or rejected." The importance of refutation within the debate is well established.

Some of the debate ballots surveyed draw a distinction between refutation and rebuttal by placing each area on the

ballot to be rated separately. However, it is more often the practice to use the single term "refutation" to refer to both ideas. It is generally agreed that refutation is the process of destroying an argument or evidence of the opposition, while rebuttal is the rebuilding of one's own points after the opponent's refutation. The distinction between the "tearing down" and the "building up" process is important to a speaker for clarity in his presentation.

Refutation involves more than raising objections, even valid ones, to opposing proofs. The goal of attack is not achieved until valid objections are related to an issue. Similarly, one has not adequately defended his case against an opposing refutation until he has re-established his stand on an issue.

The need to attack the arguments and ideas of the other team is fundamental to debating. Therefore, the judge must be conscious of the tearing down and the rebuilding of arguments of both teams. He should evaluate each team on the extent and quality of the refutation presented during the debate.

**Delivery**

"...clearness, force, and beauty of style are absolutely necessary to one who would draw men to his way of thinking; nay, to anyone who would induce the great mass of mankind to give so much as passing heed to what he has to say."

Woodrow Wilson

The delivery of a debater is relative to the delivery of any speaker. Debate is a form of public speaking and

---

must, therefore, be judged as an integral part of the total speech. A good delivery is of great importance to the communication of ideas. "The debater's effectiveness as a speaker is a function of the way in which his audience perceives him as a whole person." This impression is of strong value in the presentation of ideas.

Good delivery should not call attention to itself and obstruct the establishment of arguments. A good speaker should use his voice, pronunciation, and bodily action to convey the meaning of the material presented. If a speaker is successful the audience will not consciously be aware of his delivery, but will only remember the ideas he expressed.

Delivery then should not ever distract from the speech but should assist the speech in every aspect.

Second, good delivery should give reinforcement to the meaning of the debater's speech. His active use of pitch, time, and volume can serve to gain emphasis and to relate meaning that could not be gained from the mere reading of the material. The audience is more interested in the material that is presented interestingly for their benefit. With these basic criteria, the debater strives to assure himself that he is communicating his ideas to the audience. He must use good delivery for his benefit, but above all else,

---


he must be explicit and complete in his presentation of the meaning he wishes to express during his speech.

The other areas sometimes listed on debate ballots are style, case, argumentation, communicativeness, and teamwork. Usually it is agreed that these areas overlap into one of the more commonly selected skills. However, since some ballots choose to be more specific in the listing of debate skills, each area is briefly defined.

**Style.**—Style refers to the force, directness, and emphasis of the presentation. It is important that the debater use a style that is effective in achieving simplicity and clarity of thought; yet, it should reflect a certain degree of freshness, variety, and interest in his delivery. Style includes word choice, sentence structure, figures of speech, and vocabulary level.

**Case.**—The case of a debate team is a composite of several other debate skills. First, it is the selection of arguments to be presented involving the analysis of the individual members. Organization is a vital part of the case in that it determines the arrangement of arguments into a creditable speech. Reasoning is the use of the evidence and is a part of the total case in persuading the listener. Therefore, even though the case may be individually considered, it is highly integrated into all the skills listed on the more popular ballots.
Argumentation.—Argumentation, as mentioned earlier, is the combination of the two elements of evidence and reasoning. By combining the two separate areas, the debater is able to present certain arguments that provide the basis for the total case to be used during the debate.

Communicativeness.—In Championship Debating, Arthur Kruger defines communicativeness as the matter of style, organization, attack, and defense contributing to the image of each speaker. This division like some other skills is simply a different name for the same material covered in other areas. Delivery is the main ingredient of communicativeness and its characteristics are found in the other areas.

Teamwork.—Teamwork or total effectiveness is the total performance of the two members of the debate team. It includes the cooperation of each member with the other and the relative compatibility of the two speakers in forming a team. It is important for the team to create the impression of working well with each other in order to present one unified and consistent approach to the opposition.

An investigation of any remaining areas found on a few ballots revealed that it is either not generally accepted as important in determining the winner of the debate or that

---

13 Kruger, op. cit., p. 22.
the specific area is an integral portion of at least one of the other skill areas already listed.

**Types of Debate Ballots**

Since all the requirements for an effective ballot are not generally agreed upon, the range of available ballots is numerous. This study did not make an attempt to record or to review each of the many ballots but selected one from each basic type and identified the style and the material included in it. In reviewing the more popular ballots selected for tournament use, the theoretical criteria imposed upon judges for determining their decision was detected.

**Win-Loss Ballot**

The simplest method of ballot arrangement is the "win and loss" method. The judge indicates only the winner of the debate, and he determines the winner on any basis he selects. The judge can complete this ballot with maximum rapidity and minimum cogitation.

This elementary ballot may be selected for judges who decide the winner solely upon the arguments used and therefore need nothing else to help determine their decision. This simple ballot was often used in the past because the more elaborate judging sheets were not so widely acceptable as they are today. The following illustration is a sample of the "win-loss" type of ballot.
Figure 1

DEBATE BALLOT

Choose the winning team on the basis of what you consider effective debating.

I vote for the ____________________________.

Signed ____________________________

---

**Quality Rating Ballot**

Although seldom used for intercollegiate debating, the quality rating ballot is available. The major difference between this ballot and all others is that the judge does not declare a winner in the debate. The debate teacher may feel it is not advisable to determine a winner in such cases as practice debates or debates between two schools requiring only a quality rating. In other similar situations, a debate coach may feel that a declaration of a winner defeats the educational objectives of debate. "They further argue that the deciding of a winning team is extremely difficult, particularly when the competing sides are evenly matched; that judgments of this type are subjective; that a win-loss decision does not reflect the comparative abilities of the two sides; and that winning often gives a student a sense of false pride."\(^\text{11}\)

\(^{11}\) Braden and Brandenburg, *op. cit.*, p. 524.
The quality rating ballot consists of rating each speaker and each team as superior, excellent, average, fair, or poor. The judge determines the rating to be given to each team by one of several standards depending on the specific purpose of the debate. For tournament use, this ballot could be used and the criteria for quality rating could be limited to a comparison of only the teams at the tournament. This comparison contrasts the more widely used practice of rating the speakers in relation to a predetermined degree of excellency. Figure 2 is an example of this type ballot.

**Combination Ballot**

The combination ballot boasts characteristics of both the win-loss ballot and the quality rating system. This type ballot is primarily for the director who wants a decision to be determined and also wants each team to receive a quality rating. In this manner, the tournament director can use the decision to advance teams and the quality ratings to break ties. The rating can also be used by coaches after the tournament in evaluating the school teams. The ballot remains relatively simple, but the emphasis is still on the two basic approaches of evaluation: the win-loss approach and the quality rating approach.

Figure 3 illustrates this type of ballot.
Figure 2
QUALITY RATING BALLOT

Speaker ratings: On the basis of his performance, assign to each speaker one of the following quality ratings: superior, excellent, average, fair, and poor. Consider such characteristics as analysis, organization, argument and supporting facts, refutation, language, delivery, attitudes, overall effectiveness. Equate your evaluation of these qualities in terms of all intercollegiate debaters. The judge may assign the same or different ratings to the four speakers and the two teams.

Speakers

First affirmative Rating
Second affirmative Rating
First negative Rating
Second negative Rating

Teams

Team ratings: Also assign one of the quality ratings to each team. Make your ratings consistent with your individual ratings.

Affirmative team
Negative team

Signed
Figure 3
LOUISIANA HIGH SCHOOL DEBATE BALLOT

Instruction to Judges

You are to base your decision entirely upon the skill as displayed by the debaters: (1) their ability to present and uphold their case, (2) the soundness of their arguments, (3) their ability at refutation, (4) delivery, and (5) everything that makes for effective debating.

I vote for the__________________________Team No.__________________________

Aff. or Neg.

Rank each team according to the rating scale below. The Winning Team Must Be Ranked Above the Losing Team. Give each team a place on the rating scale based upon your idea of what constitutes effective debating. Demand high-quality performance by your rankings.

Rating Scale

1. Fair
2. Average
3. Good
4. Excellent
5. Superior

Place each team on rating scale:

Affirmative__________________________Rank on scale
Negative__________________________Rank on scale
Signed______________________________

Please sign and return to the director of the tournament.

Do not announce your decision.

Please check your ballot. Have you filled your ballot completely?
A more detailed quality rating ballot emphasizes specific areas of debate. This ballot is designed for the judge who is concerned with certain debate skills. It does not provide any space for comment from the judge to the debaters or their coach. The major objective of the ballot is to total the points awarded to the designated skills and to announce the winner. The ballot is divided into two identical parts so that the ballot may be torn and a section given to each debate team.

The specific areas chosen for the ballot are left to the discretion of the tournament director since the debating world has not yet determined the exact areas of concentration. Many of the specific skills are related, and the meaning of some terms overlap so that the final selection of certain skill areas may not be important.

At this point it is important to recognize one of the serious objections raised by many leaders against the "skills" type ballot. In most cases the ballot makes no distinction between the several areas listed. The judge is puzzled: Does one of the above areas deserve more weight in determining the final decision than any other? Should they each be equal in value and the final decision is merely a sum total of the various areas listed? Do I as a judge feel that argument should be equal to delivery in this debate? Each of these questions plus many others is often asked and the answer is not always available. In most cases, the general
feeling is that the areas are not equal in value and should vary with each debate. However, no one leader in debate seems to be ready to express upon what grounds the value should change.

Figure 4, the first of these two ballots in consideration, indicates a format for the critic judge who is well-oriented in the "skills" school. Figure 5, the second and more elaborate ballot of the same type, requires more information in the form of quality ratings of each speaker and of each team than the first ballot. This second ballot is similar to the type most often used in regular tournament competition.

Wayne State Ballot

Wayne State University developed a ballot designed to answer the demands of the "issues" school of thought. The judge lists first the winner of the debate. Second, he rates the teams and the individual speaker as to their debating ability compared with his knowledge of debaters' ability in general. Finally, the lower portion of the ballot is devoted to the skill areas often found on other debate ballots. The major difference in this ballot and others is that the judge does not award points in rating the speakers in each designated skill. Instead, in a provided space the judge lists or explains the efforts of the individual speaker and gives helpful advice to each debater. In this way the basic material is covered by the judge; however, the emphasis is not
Figure 4

OFFICIAL BALLOT

INSTRUCTIONS: Please rate each speaker on each item. Five equals superior; four, excellent; three, average; two, fair; and one, poor.

AFFIRMATIVE TEAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st Affirmative</th>
<th>2nd Affirmative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argument and facts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refutation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total________________          Total________________

Affirmative total____          Negative total____

NEGATIVE TEAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st Negative</th>
<th>2nd Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argument and facts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refutation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total________________          Total________________

Affirmative total____          Negative total____

I vote for ____________________________
Signed______________________________

NOTE: Put comments for affirmative on upper half of back of sheet and for negative on lower half. After the debate the ballot will be torn in two and the comments will be given to the respective teams.
Figure 5

UNIVERSITY DEBATING TEAMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Round</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Judge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aff. Team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vs. Neg. Team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank Points</th>
<th>Rank Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Aff. Speaker</td>
<td>1st Neg. Speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Aff. Speaker</td>
<td>2nd Neg. Speaker</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Team Totals (points) Aff. | Neg.

In my opinion, the more effective debating was done by the

Team from ____________________________ (Signed) ____________________________
(Name of College) (Judge)

To the Judge: Please fill in the entire ballot. Please do not render a decision as a tie. The debaters will greatly appreciate it if you will write your comments on the back of the appropriate section below. These sections will be given to the teams as indicated. The above section is for our files.

Speaker's Norms: 7 or below poor; 8 to 13 fair; 14 to 19 good; 20 to 25 excellent; 26 to 30 superior.

Team Norms: 14 or below poor; 15 to 26 fair; 27 to 38 good; 39 to 50 excellent; 51 to 60 superior.

FOR THE TEAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aff.</th>
<th>vs. Neg.</th>
<th>Judge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I. Quality of Debating

Note: Assign to each speaker the points which best describe your evaluation of the quality of debating done in each of the six places. 1-poor; 2-fair; 3-good; 4-excellent; 5-superior.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. ()</td>
<td>1. ()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ()</td>
<td>2. ()</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis-plan of case
Knowledge and evidence
Reasoning, inferences
Adapting to opposing case
Skill in refutation
Speaking skill
Speaker's totals (points)
Team totals (points) Aff. | Neg.

II. Rank of Debaters

Note: Please rank debaters in order of their excellence by placing 1, 2, 3, or 4 in the parentheses to the right of the debater's name in all three sections of this form.

III. Decision: The more effective debating was done by: ____________________________
placed on the skill areas as it often is on other ballots. The judge determines the winner regardless of the score on the ballot; then he rates the team considering an overall debating ability; finally, he devotes the remainder of the ballot to a critique. Each of the basic functions of a ballot are included and the judge is still able to evaluate the debate on the issues presented.

The basic areas selected for use on the ballot are case and analysis, support of issues, attack and defense, delivery, and audience adaptation. The first three skills involve the arguments and case presented. Therefore, the ballot lends itself easily to the "issues" judge. The last two divisions deal with the persuasive ability of the debater by considering the delivery and audience adaptation of the speaker. Since the areas do not ask for a quality rating by the judge, it is evident that there could be no confusion as to the value of one area over the others. The problem of equal or unequal value that often plagues the "skills" ballot is eliminated and the value of helpful judges' comments in the specified areas is maintained. For the judge who would make his decision on the basis of the "issues" presented and debated, this ballot is both useful and simple for the judge to use.

Figure 6 is an example of this type ballot.
"DEBATE DAY IN DETROIT"

WASHU STATE UNIVERSITY

ROUND: ____________________ AFFIRMATIVE: ____________________ NEGATIVE: ____________________

DECISION: In my opinion the better debating was done by the ____________________ side, representing ____________________ school ____________________

__________________________________________________________ Judge

______________________________

AFFIRMATIVE CRITIQUE SHEET

Above

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Superior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative team: 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Affirmative: 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Affirmative: 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1st Aff. ____________________ 2nd Aff. ____________________

Case and Analysis

Support of Issues (Evidence & Reasoning)

Attack and Defense

Delivery

Audience Adaptation
American Forensic Association Ballot

The evolution of the several types of ballots developed into what may be the greatest single advance in all debate history—the uniform ballot published by the American Forensic Association. The member coaches of the association constructed a ballot that received more widespread approval than any other ballot in the past. The use of the American Forensic Association ballot continued to grow until it was accepted as the universal debate ballot. The availability of a standardized ballot simplified many different debating problems. First, the director no longer had to develop a ballot to satisfy the needs of his tournament. Second, the teams participating in the contest understood the ballot used by the debate judge and in accordance could organize their presentation to best suit the demands of it. Third, the ballot made judging much easier for the critic since the major portion of all contest judges is composed of visiting debate coaches and the coach, having used the ballot often, became extremely familiar with it. Finally, the new ballot created an overall standard by which a debate coach could evaluate his own teams. By simply comparing the standard ballot of several different tournaments, he could form a more reliable judgment of the quality of his teams. Therefore, the standardized ballot became helpful to both debaters and debate coaches for several reasons.
The acceptance of the American Forensic Association ballot also hinged on two basic conveniences. The ballot could be ordered from the secretary of the association. In addition to this convenience in ordering, the ballot was especially beneficial to the judge and the tournament director. The ballot came in triplicate form with carbon paper so that three copies were simultaneously completed. After receiving the ballot from the judge, the director could separate the three copies and retain one copy for his permanent record, a second for the affirmative team, and the third copy for the negative team. This carbon ballot was universally appreciated since each debate coach could have a copy of the entire criticism of the debate rather than just that portion applicable to his team. Each school received a copy, the director retained a copy, and the judge was not burdened with the task of making three separate ballots. The convenience of this form, more than anything else, helped standardize the debate ballot.

The first ballot developed by the American Forensic Association was the "general skills" approach. The form was composed of four boxes of information, one per speaker, to aid the judge in giving quality ratings of each speaker's presentation. Each speaker was rated as 1-poor, 2-below average, 3-average, 4-good, or 5-superior. These ratings were applied to each of the areas of analysis, evidence, argumentation, refutation, and delivery. In addition, each team
was given a rating of poor, below average, average, good, or superior. The final portion of the ballot was devoted to the decision by asking which team did the better debating. The judge was given a relatively small space at the bottom of the page to explain upon what basis the decision was granted.

The structure of the ballot reveals many important reasons for its rapid acceptance. First, the areas selected to represent the skills of the debater were those most generally accepted on other ballots. Second, the ballot contained the rating of both the speakers and the teams. Third, and perhaps most important, the ballot although containing the skill areas in no way dictated the method of deciding the winner. The decision was implied to be closely related to the skills that dominated the major portion of space on the ballot, but direct reference was not given to those skills. Also the skill areas were not divided into those of greater importance and those of lesser importance; they were listed together and no reference was given to the relative value of the areas receiving quality ratings. Even though the ballot was specific in its style and form, it was general in the crucial aspects of judgment so that it could be used for most any purpose the judge wanted. Certainly, the ballot could be used by either the "skills" or the "issues" school.
The major criticism of the American Forensic Association ballot was the lack of space provided for the judges' comments. Most coaches, or judges, believed that a ballot was not of maximum benefit unless the critic was given the opportunity to make certain suggestions to the debate teams. Though the skill areas measured the quality of the speaker, any specific help on the case presented and the attacks made was evaded. This criticism was solved in several ways. First, the original ballot was slightly rearranged so that a portion of the bottom of the sheet could be used for general comments. Still another ballot answered the problem even more completely. The soon to be popular Form C ballot provided about one third of the page for the skill areas; the other two thirds of the page was for specific comments to the individual debaters. This extra space proved helpful in answering the objections raised against the original form. Now the judge could write individual suggestions to the speakers, explain weak areas, and/or elaborate on the reasons for his decision.

The new Form C made three additional changes that proved to be well accepted. The quality ratings were changed from the original 1-poor, 2-below average, 3-average, 4-good, and 5-superior to an even more usable scale reading 1-poor, 2-fair, 3-average, 4-excellent, and 5-superior. The changes in wording did not seem important but did better reflect the customary reactions to performances.
The second change found on the ballot was the addition of a ranking system for each speaker. In addition to the portion for the debater's name and the comments directed toward him, there was a specific place for the speaker to be ranked in relation to the other speakers of that one debate. In each of the new ballots, the reason for deciding the winner was removed and the judge was expected to relate this information in the "comment" section of the form.

The final innovation was the use of special paper within the ballot so that carbon paper was not needed to make the three copies. The triplicate form continued but was now even more useful without the extra sheets of carbon paper. This added convenience encouraged many more tournament directors to adopt one of the new forms of the American Forensic Association ballot. Figure 7 is a copy of the Form C American Forensic Association ballot.

It would be false to assume that the American Forensic Association ballot has become exclusively adopted for tournament use. Many directors prefer to use a ballot of their own design, seeking the purpose they feel best represents the criteria for determining a decision.

**National West Point Ballot**

The last ballot to consider is the ballot used each year at the national debate tournament at West Point.
American Forensic Association Debate Ballot

Figure 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Side</th>
<th>Round</th>
<th>Room</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Judge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st Affirmative</th>
<th>2nd Affirmative</th>
<th>1st Negative</th>
<th>2nd Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Reasoning</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Refutation</th>
<th>Delivery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total__________ Total__________ Total__________ Total__________

Ratings: AFFIRMATIVE: poor fair average excellent superior
NEGATIVE: poor fair average excellent superior

Each debater in order of excellence (1st for best, 2nd for next best, etc.).

MENTIONS:
Aff. (name)____________Rank ( ) 1st Neg. (name)____________Rank ( )

Aff. (name)____________Rank ( ) 2nd Neg. (name)____________Rank ( )

My opinion, the better debating was done by the_____________(AFFIRMATIVE OR NEGATIVE)
This tournament is unique in all other contests since it is the final event in a series of elimination debates held throughout the United States. The winners of the regional eliminations are invited to attend the national tournament in order to determine the national champion debate team. The high level of competition and the honor involved in receiving an invitation are the basic reasons for the prestige of the West Point Tournament.

In the elimination rounds, the tournament requires at least five judges to participate in each debate. A total of over seventy persons are involved in the capacity of critic judges. This large number of judges is composed of persons highly oriented in the field of argumentation and debate. Each volunteer helps in the annual national tournament without remuneration. The high quality of judges is the key to the success of this contest.

The ballot at the national tournament is comparatively simple when related to those ballots used at some other tournaments. The judge is asked to rate the individual speakers and then rate the team as a unit; the team rating is not necessarily an average of the two individual ratings. The judge is then directed to award the winning of the debate to the team who received the highest rating. The point scale to be used is Superior, 50-61; Excellent 40-51; Good 30-41. No team is to receive a rating below 21 by the assumption that debaters representing a district are above average.
The ballot does not specify upon what standard the rating points shall be determined; it contains none of the normal skill areas usually found on all other ballots. The judge is simply instructed to rate the individual and the team. In the same manner there is a lack of instruction as to the criteria that should be employed to determine the winner. The evaluation should be on the same standard as the awarding of rating points since the two scores must agree. It must be concluded that the standard of judgment is left entirely to the discretion of the individual judge. It is important to recognize that the lack of "debate skills" on the ballot is of significance in that they are normally listed. This would tend to imply that the decision can be based on the issues presented or on the skills that the judge feels are important. The decision reads, "In my opinion, the better debating was done by________." Consequently, the only conclusion to be drawn from this ballot is that the speech teachers and directors who judge decide the winner of the debate by their own standards.

It must not be overlooked that the high quality of judges used at this particular tournament accounts for the simple approach of the ballot.

Figure 8 is a sample copy of the judge's ballot used at the national West Point Tournament.
INSTRUCTIONS: (1) First, rate the effectiveness of each speaker as a debater. (2) Second, rate the effectiveness of the two debaters as a team. (3) The team effectiveness score is NOT an average of individual speaker’s scores. The team score should determine the decision. (4) Do not discuss your judgment of this debate until the completion of the seeding rounds. (5) Make relevant comments on sheets provided for this purpose.

POINT SCALE: Superior, 50-41; Excellent, 40-31; Good, 30-21. Do not rate below 21, it being assumed that any team which is representing a district is at least above the average. This scale is to be used in evaluating both individual and team performances.

FILE COPY

__________________________
Affirmative

__________________________
Negative

1st (name) 2nd (name) 1st (name) 2nd (name)

Score____ Score____ Score____ Score____

Team Score____ Team Score____

Decision

In my opinion, the better debating was done by

__________________________
(School)

__________________________
(Side)

Signed__________________________
Instruction Sheets for Judges

After selection of the proper judge and preparation of a desirable ballot, the tournament director is not assured that the two will function smoothly. At this point the planning usually halts and the remainder of the decision is left to the circumstances as they present themselves during the debate. However, it is often desirable to continue with the planning and take one additional step to insure that a fair decision shall be granted and that the decision will be accurately recorded on the ballot. Dorothy Garrett Melzer from Georgetown College suggests that the additional safeguard be agreed upon before the tournament begins. She proposes that "a discussion of even an hour's time could be held among the judges so that basic agreement might be reached as to the most important points in judging the debates to come would be a big advantage. Although we hardly expect any group of coaches to agree on all points, there should be agreement on basic points of judging which would in turn make for harmony in the whole tournament." The basic reason for such a meeting is to iron out the problems that often create a lack of understanding between debaters and coaches. She further states that unless there was an extremely large number of judges involved, such a short meeting could be held.

If because of schedules or other awkward circumstances the meeting cannot be arranged, the next best alternative is to provide a mimeographed form which would thoroughly indicate the specific instructions to be followed. Quite naturally the form is not as personal as a meeting and cannot answer all the questions that often occur, but it does prevent the judge from being totally unprepared as to the proper method of using the debate ballot. With the instruction sheet, the tournament director can explain the type of decision that he believes important and upon what basis the decision should be reached.

By listing the important aspects of debating, the director can make a positive attempt to unify the different standards of the experienced debate coach of several years and the uninformed lay member asked to assist in the local speech contest. The suggestion by Helzer to use an information sheet for the judges is not a new idea for most tournament directors. The type and purpose of the information sheet, however, may vary. To obtain a clear understanding of the attempt to coordinate the judge and the ballot, a survey of several suggestion sheets of various tournaments in the Southwest was examined. This examination was another method of discovering the theoretical approach of judging a contest debate.

The typical information and instruction sheet that accompanies the ballot is usually one page in length. It is
not uncommon to find that the first item explains the
purpose of the tournament, introduces the sponsor, and
extends appreciation to the judge for offering his services.
Following the formal introduction of the event is a state-
ment of the debate proposition and the procedure of college
debating. It often explains that each speaker will have a
ten minute constructive speech and a five minute rebuttal
speech will follow. At this point it would seem that a
serious problem exists. Either the judge is bored by the
obviously unnecessary information and loses interest in the
remainder of the sheet, or if such information is necessary,
the quality of the judge is questionable.

Finally, the information sheet expresses the important
aspects of debate and attempts to ease the problem of making
an evaluation. By not explaining the exact principle for
making a decision, the major purpose of the suggestion sheet
is not developed. The information is vague and incomplete,
allowing the experienced debate coach as well as the unin-
formed layman free opportunity to award the decision on
practically any criterion. When a basis for a decision is
listed, it is usually brief and not forcefully expressed.

Baylor Invitational Forensic Tournament

The first "Instructions for Judges" sheet to be examined
was from Baylor University's tournament. It devoted the
first two paragraphs to explaining the tournament, stating
the debate proposition, and identifying the speeches of the
The real purpose of the sheet is not found until the third portion which deals with the basis for the judge's decision. The judge is warned against awarding his decision solely on the preference of his personal opinion on the subject. He is then introduced to the areas of analysis, evidence, argument, refutation, and delivery to be used in judging the teams. The relative importance of the above skills is concluded by the statement, "Speech skills are never an end within themselves, but they are important as the means to the end of communicating information, ideas, and feelings to others. In considering the above standards, vote for the team that makes the best total impression on you. Too many minor errors may affect your total impression of a team, but attempt to base your decision upon the overall ability of the debater to communicate his arguments to you."

The remainder of the sheet explains the rating system for each speaker and team. The judge is finally instructed to return his completed ballot to the proper location. In this particular information sheet, it is quite clear that the decision is to be based on the communicative ability of the speakers. It is inferred that the skills listed should be the major factor to be considered in the judge's decision. However, the instructions include neither a breakdown of the

---

16 Earlier Invitational Forensic Tournament, "Instructions to Judges included in the ballot given to each judge at the tournament," February 6-7, 1969.
relative importance of one skill over another nor the value of each skill. The basis for the decision was left open to several possibilities.

Georgetown University Invitational Debating Tournament

The second sheet examined was from the Georgetown University Invitational Debating Tournament. This particular aid for the judges is two pages in length. The first page is devoted only to instructions to the judge concerning the mechanics of the contest; the second page contains the basis for judging. An explanation states that the debate is not to be determined on the merits of the question itself, but rather on the team who does the more effective debating. The judge must evaluate on the grounds of which team gained the belief of the audience for the side they represented. With this distinction the set of instructions lists the elements by which the judge may decide who did the better debating. The debate skills are similar to those found on some other debate ballots with the exception being that the skills are more extensively divided into nine different categories consisting of knowledge of subject, analysis, organization, evidence, argument, adaptation, refutation and rebuttal, delivery, and teamwork. The first skill, knowledge of the subject, is in reality a subdivision of the second skill, analysis. Knowledge of the subject would certainly be reflected in the type of interpretation given on the various
issues selected for use during the debate. Additional knowledge of the subject should be reflected in the rebuttal of the opposition's arguments. The use of "adaptation" refers to the ability of a debater who is able to adapt his constructive and rebuttal speeches to the opponent's case. Again it is obvious that there is a certain degree of overlapping in the skill areas. A speaker's ability to adapt should be strongly reflected in the area of "refutation and rebuttal." The success of refutation is not only how well a debater attacks his opponent but also with what degree of competence he selects the arguments to refute. "Teamwork" deals entirely with how well the team functions together.

Each of the other areas are defined similar to the basic areas already discussed. The instructions to the judge simply explain the meaning of each area then directs him to use these skills as the only criteria for evaluating the debate.

The actual value that should be applied to each skill and its importance within the debate was explained in the last paragraph of the instructions.

No particular weighing in percentages is given to each of those factors since they are quite interrelated. They merely suggest a framework for consideration and each judge in a particular debate may utilize them as he sees fit. Furthermore, the value of each of these factors may vary from debate to debate. For example, a debate in which the negative team offered a substitute plan which is ignored by the affirmative could well be judged on the basis of analysis alone. Both teams in this situation should be
aware that the debate hinges around which plan is the better solution to the problem. If the affirmative keeps arguing that there is a problem which would have been admitted by the negative they would obviously lose the debate upon the basis of analysis alone. More often, all factors are considered.

Therefore, in this particular information sheet it is made extremely clear to the judge that no real value is attached to each of the skills. The judge was free to use any or all of the skills that he chose and could weigh the value as he deemed necessary in terms of the particular debate he judged.

**Savage Forensic Tournament**

The responsibility of the affirmative and of the negative teams is the first item listed on the instructions to debate judges used at the Savage Forensic Tournament of Southeastern State College of Oklahoma. After explaining the need of advocacy and of clash and rebuttal, the four areas of concern for the judge are listed. The critic is encouraged to recognize that good debating is essentially good public speaking. The speakers are required to utilize those principles of argumentation and persuasion to establish the best possible case or to oppose arguments presented by the other team. By this argument the major "duty of the speaker is to persuade his audience, or you the judge, that

---

17 Georgetown University Invitational Debating Tournament, "Instructions given to each judge with his ballot."
he has presented the better case." Second, good debating is logical reasoning that is derived from a foundation of sound evidence. It is important to recognize and dismiss fallacious premises that are presented during the exchange of arguments. Third, delivery that will result in good communicative speech is emphasized. The voice is evaluated in terms of suitability for debate. The voice should not call attention to itself but rather should serve as a medium for communicating the speaker's ideas. The last criterion is that of refutation. The attack of arguments is not to be limited to the rebuttal speeches, and the judge should be aware of the use of refutation throughout the eight speeches.

This instruction sheet for judges is more specific than the other two but still does not give a percentage value of the criteria mentioned. The judge is guided in the direction of argumentation and refutation as important aspects in deciding the winner. Since delivery is inserted to serve as a major criterion, the basic approach must be classified as the "skills" method. The skills are limited but are generally represented by the four areas listed on the instruction sheet.

Golden Spread Forensic Tournament
The fourth sheet selected for examination was from the Golden Spread Forensic Tournament in Amarillo, Texas. The

18 Savage Forensic Tournament, Southeastern State College, Durant, Oklahoma, "Instructions to debate judges given to each judge with his ballot."
largest portion of this handout for the judge is composed of general information on the mechanics of the contest. The judge is not told specifically what standards to use but a value of certain skills is dictated. It clearly states that "more weight should be given to evidence and argument and refutation than to speaking ability. However, if the two teams are equal on evidence and argument, then the team doing the superior speaking should win. Make your decision considering all of the factors of the debate." The information provided, rather than listing each of the normal items used to judge a contest, lists only three items. More importantly, there is a definite value placed on evidence and argument over delivery. At least the judge does have a sense of standards with which he is to be most concerned during the development of the debate.

**Tournament at The University of Southern Mississippi**

The suggestions to debate judges used at the tournament at The University of Southern Mississippi is primarily an explanation of the speaking order of the debaters and the needed information for filling out the ballot. The single comment concerning the decision is that the decision should go to the team who "...in your estimation did the better

19*Golden Spread Forensic Tournament, Amarillo, Texas, "Instructions given to each judge with his ballot."
job of convincing you of their arguments.\footnote{University of Southern Mississippi Tournament, "Suggestions to Debate Judges."} Although the standard American Forensic Association Form C ballot was used, the instruction sheet placed no strong emphasis on who won the arguments. The judge could easily become confused as to the purpose of listing the several skills on the ballot when he is asked to decide who won the arguments.

**Central State College Tournament**

The final instruction sheet to be considered in this review was the sheet from the Central State College Tournament in Edmond, Oklahoma. There are two pages of information for the judge. The first page explains the role of the affirmative team as the advocate and the negative team as the aggressor. The second page deals entirely with evaluating debaters and awarding the decision. An outline for the judge's benefit clarifies the material projected for his consideration.

A. Evaluation

1. Case and analysis
   a. Was the argument in the case prima facie? Would this speech compel action if there were no opponents?
   b. Was the evidence sufficient to establish a reasonable presumption (probability) for each argument?
   c. Did the speaker's argument reveal a basic grasp of the proposition?
2. Attack and defense
   a. Was the refutation of opponents' arguments clear, reasonable, and supported by evidence?
   b. Was the defense or rebuilding of arguments clear, reasonable, and supported by evidence?
   c. Did the speaker select the most vital arguments for attack and defense?

3. Presentation
   a. Was the speaker's use of voice and bodily action effective without being exhibitory, calling attention to itself as "technique"?
   b. Was the speaker's attitude toward his opponents courteous, fair, and mature?
   c. Did he reveal an understanding of debate as a method?

B. Giving the decision
   1. You may vote on the basis of:
      a. All three evaluation items listed above.
      b. The total skill in debating demonstrated.
      c. What the team did as a team.

   2. Do not vote on the basis of:
      a. Your private opinion on the proposition.
      b. The smoothness of the speaker's delivery alone.
      c. On the exchange of argument alone.  

Three major areas expressed are case and analysis, attack and defense, and presentation. A combination of all three areas is the first suggestion for evaluating the debate. If the judge does not want to limit himself to just these three areas, he may also consider the total debating skills. His last consideration is determining "what the team did as a

---

21 Central State College Tournament, "The Outline given to the judge to guide him in determining his decision."
team." It is important to recognize that these suggestions are among the few that explicitly dictate to the judge the standard for his judgment. In addition, the sheet explains that judgment should not be formed on the basis of only delivery or the exchange of arguments. The indication is that he should judge on several factors and not limit his decision on the basis of only one specific area. The judge is definitely directed away from deciding on the issues of the debate. The additional discouragement from using only delivery is clear and meaningful for the critic. The emphasis is placed upon the use of several criteria with special attention upon case and analysis, attack and defense, and delivery.

Ideally, in any debate tournament the director should call a meeting of all persons, both local judges and attending coaches, and discuss the bases or basis for deciding the winner of the forthcoming debates. An understanding of the proper emphasis of the debate would provide more uniformity for the entire tournament. Since this is seldom possible, the next best approach, and one often practiced, is to issue an instruction sheet describing the factors to be evaluated. Of the several instruction sheets reviewed, most were indefinite as to the desired standards for judgment. Two sets of instructions explained the need

\[\text{22 Ibid.}\]
for evaluating the arguments presented. Others indicated
the use of debating skills as the means of determining the
winner. All the instruction sheets lacked a specific inter-
pretation of the criteria necessary for the judges to render
consistent decisions. Therefore, the intention to help the
judge was not fully accomplished because of the lack of
information and standards to follow. The tournament
directors' philosophy reflected in the instruction sheets
issued to the judges is in keeping with the ballots used in
that neither the instructions nor the ballots limit the
judges' standards for determining the winner of a debate.
Rather, the instructions serve only to provide a system by
which the judge may make his own choice as to the necessary
criteria he wishes to use.

Chapter Summary

For those judges of the "skills" school, the major
purpose of the debate ballot is to list the areas by which
the contest must be judged. The only complication derived
from this is in the determination of which specific criteria
should be selected. In contrast, those persons of the
"issues" school believe that since the debate must be
decided upon the issues which are presented and refuted, in
no way must the ballot decide the winner of the debate; it
must serve only to reflect the decision made by the judge,
independent of the material listed on the ballot. The main
function of the ballot is to reflect the decision of the
judge and to report the quality of the debaters' work. This report can be in the form of individual or team ratings or a ranking of the individual speakers. The ballot should be designed to provide further help for the students in the development of their debating ability.

A quick glance at the several types of ballots used confirms the fact that there is definite indecision as to the proper categories to be used by the judge. The divided sections of the skill areas found on ballots range from three or four items to the elaborate ballot listing as many as nine specific areas which are to be rated. The ballot selected to represent the "issues" school had first of all a place to record the winner of the debate; and second, a place to rate the team or individual speakers. This rating would not necessarily be divided into the skill areas but would be just an overall rating of performance.

The debate ballots used in tournament competition range from the simple win-loss ballot to the more detailed ones used for determining the skills of each debater. Each ballot, as well as the American Forensic Association ballot, did not specify the method that the judge should use to determine his decision. In each case the ballot asked specific information of the judge but neither dictated a value on any of the skill areas listed nor indicated that all areas are equal in value. The ballot used at the West Point National Tournament did not provide for skill areas to be
rated. This provided an approximate comparative level of each team and did not lead the judge in making his decision. The judge was free to decide on the skills presented or on just the issues won or lost in determining his decision.

It would be normal to expect that the instruction sheets which are usually handed to the judge before the debate would indicate the method by which the decision should be reached. In those surveyed, the most preferred evaluation procedure of instruction sheets was vague and undefined. Some of the sheets indicated that argumentation should be valued higher than other areas, but no explanation as to how much higher was given. In one case the judge was guided to make his decision on the total performance of the team, the case presentation and the attack and refutation, or the debating skill of the team. The judge was not to make his decision just on delivery or on the exchange of arguments.

The use of either the American Forensic Association ballot or a specially designed ballot should reflect some specific method of evaluating the two teams and awarding the decision. The ballots and the instruction sheets made an attempt to guide the judges' decisions, but they were broad in their statements and noncommittal in the exact preferred criteria to be employed in decision making. An attempt should be made before each tournament to bring the judges together in deciding on a more unified procedure of evaluating the debates. The ballots were not specific but indicated that
most of the tournament directors would encourage the decision to be granted on the grounds of which team demonstrated the better skills in total debating technique. However, it must be recognized that a significant number of tournaments, including the National West Point Tournament, employed a ballot that did not lead the judge toward skills but toward the winning of arguments as the primary criterion in deciding the winner of a debate.
CHAPTER V

ACTUAL CRITERIA EMPLOYED BY TOURNAMENT JUDGES

It is the height of inconsistency for us, as coaches, to stress to our debaters the importance of knowing and following the rules of debate, and then to subject them to be judged on how well they have learned and are able to apply what they have learned, by a judge who is not familiar with the yardstick by which the progress of these students should be measured. 1

The attack against debate judges is always heard after each tournament. The coaches recognize the problem exists because of the lack of acceptable persons available for judging, but the students continue to complain about the type of judge that is asked to serve as a critic. To leaders in the debate field, the inconsistency of the grounds for determining winners is alarming. In each tournament, there are always reports of judges who asked the debaters to explain the normal speaking order or the basis for a good debate. Students often report that the judge just could not have voted against them in that particular debate but later when the results are announced they were mistaken on their assumption. Such feelings about this type of judge were discussed in The Forensic in March, 1959. In his article,

Roy T. Baker explained that at a tournament he had recently attended a
gentleman had accompanied another team whose coach "had something else on and couldn't come." This judge was director of the department of religious education, and probably well qualified in his field. During the course of the meal he told me that he had judged an "excellent, old-time, fire-eating team just before lunch." When I inquired as to what he meant, he replied that this team had completely overpowered their opposition with a barrage of some twenty questions--most of them in rebuttal--"so many that they couldn't possibly answer them all!". 2

Accusations are continually made concerning the inferior quality of debate judges. Because of the incongruity in debate decisions in a tournament, there is a need to investigate the bases for judges' decisions.

This chapter reports a study made of four debate tournaments held in the Southwest. The study was made in an effort to discover more about the actual practices the debate judges employed for tournament use. What type of judge was used during the debate? What does he consider to be most important in a debate? How much emphasis does he place on argumentation, organization, analysis, and delivery? The answers to each of these questions and others were sought in the special study. One of the problems for this study was to construct an acceptable questionnaire that reflected the basic philosophy of each judge and explained the value he placed on each of several debating skills.

2Ibid.
Special Questionnaire for Judges

The first criterion for the construction of this special questionnaire was that it should be as simple as possible and yet sufficiently clear to explain its purpose and to record accurate information from each judge. Therefore, the ballot in this study was designed to occupy no more than one single page so as not to offer a difficult task, preventing judges from becoming discouraged in completing the questionnaire. Second, the information asked of the judge was specific, uncomplicated in language style, and sought to identify the philosophy of the judge toward debate judging. Third, the ballot was designed in such a way so as not to lead the judge in answering the several questions, but to obtain the most accurate information possible. Fourth, a portion of the ballot was developed to discover the judge’s occupation and his experience in judging debate. Fifth, the ballot was used in actual debate competition but not in such a way as to interfere with or affect the routine of the tournament or the decision of the judge being questioned.

Administering the Questionnaire

The survey was conducted during four different tournaments and permission was granted for use of the study. A small envelope, 3½ by 6½ inches, was inserted into the regular envelope that contained the debate ballot for that specific round of debate. In this way the envelopes received
by the judge was the same as those received in each of the other rounds. In the upper left portion on the outside of the small envelope containing the questionnaire was printed in capital letters, "SPECIAL RESEARCH QUESTIONNAIRE FOR JUDGES." Immediately under the title were the instructions to the judge, "Please do not open until after you have completed your ballot." The judge completed the regular debate ballot and then opened the smaller envelope to answer the questionnaire. In this manner the study in no way interfered with the judge's decision of the debate. After filling in the necessary information on the questionnaire sheet, the judge then placed the sheet back into the envelope with the ballot and returned it to the tournament director.

In each of the four tournaments, the special ballot was distributed to the judges in just one of the rounds of debate. The purpose of using only one round was to prevent any judge from filling in more than one of the questionnaires. The major intention was to discover in any one round of debate the type of judge that was used and the basis for his decision as to who won the debate. To further insure that a debate coach who might be in attendance at more than one of the tournaments did not fill out more than one questionnaire, an announcement was made instructing that the questionnaire should not be filled out by a judge for a second time.
**Argumentation versus Debating Skills**

The special ballot was divided into three separate parts. The first part was designed to discover the basic philosophy of the judge in making debate decisions. The survey of current textbooks, articles in speech periodicals, and the modern debate ballots reflect the differences of belief between the "issues" and the "skills" approaches to judging. The judge was asked to indicate which of the two schools of thought came closer to representing his own belief. To help make the difference clear to the judge and to explain the contrast between the two, a set of instructions was provided. The basic difference was explained as follows:

Judges often disagree on the basis for determining the winner in a competitive debate. Some base their decision entirely on **ARGUMENTATION**; they decide who won the argument, virtually disregarding such factors as delivery, organization, ethics, etc., which are frequently found on a debate ballot. Others base their decision on **GENERAL DEBATING SKILL**. They give approximately equal value to the skills that a debate should exhibit, with argumentation just one of the factors considered (although it may be the most important single factor in his judgment). To these judges, it is possible to lose the argument and still win the debate by demonstrating a superiority in overall skill.

Immediately following the set of instructions, the judge was asked to indicate which of the two philosophies best expressed the basis for his determining the winner of a debate. He was given a choice between only two philosophies:
Argumentation: arguments selected, evidence used, and answers to opposing arguments.

Debating skills: analysis, arguments, delivery, refutation, ethics, organization, and other factors normally found on debate ballots.

In this way the judge was directed to indicate which philosophy best reflected his belief and not necessarily which one he had used in the debate that he had just judged. The possible occurrence of a unique decision in a particular debate not reflecting the true philosophy of the judge for all debates was eliminated.

Debating Skills

The next portion of the ballot was designed to accomplish three separate functions. First, the ballot was to refer to the specific debate just judged by the critic, and to reflect the criteria he employed for determining the winner. The object was to discover what standards of judgment were actually used by the various judges in a specific situation. Second, each of the major skill areas that were used on the standard American Forensic Association ballot was listed. The selection of the same divisions of debate was made to simplify the task of the judge and to keep constant the standards that were being used. They were:

- Analysis
- Refutation
- Delivery
- Evidence
- Organization
To allow for the difference in standards that a judge might use in the debate, a sixth alternative was added so that the judge could fill in the separate area. The sixth area was listed as ___% Other (______________________). Then to help clarify any problems that the judge encountered, space was provided for any comments that needed to be made to help clarify his answers.

The judge was asked to consider each of the skills listed and then indicate the percentage value that reflected the weight that he placed on each skill during the debate. The percentage value listed by the judge could then be used to determine the importance that he placed on each of the standards and could then be averaged to the percentage values of all the other judges to determine the relative value placed on each in an actual tournament. The reason for using a percentage value in place of any other system was that these figures could be used also as a rating scale. For example, if a judge gave evidence the highest percentage value, then it would be quite obvious that he would rate evidence as first in importance. In the same manner, if he should give the lowest percentage to organization, then it would indicate on a scale that he rated organization of least importance and placed it lowest in value. Therefore, by using the system of percentages for each of the debating skills it was possible to record the relative importance of each in relationship to any one or all the other skills.
The final part of the special questionnaire was designed to discover important facts about the judge who filled in the information. Since validity is of extreme importance, the judge was asked not to sign his name for fear that some judge might be reluctant to answer the questions honestly should his name be attached to the material. This was made clear to the judge in the final paragraph which stated, "Do Not sign your name or in any way reveal the identity of the judge. The person filling in this information shall remain anonymous. The information obtained will be most vital in research for a master's thesis on debate judges."

Four specific questions were then asked of the judge:

Occupation?

Are you now or have you ever been a debate coach?

Have you had formal debate training?

Number of debates judged? (Please circle one.)

0-10 11-50 51 and above

It was important to discover the relative value of the several debate skills to judges of different occupations. It is possible that judges of certain occupations would tend to place more emphasis on some aspects of debate than upon other areas. An example is the possibility that lawyers would value evidence or reasoning higher than delivery. The divisions of several different occupations of the judges would provide
several possibilities of deriving important data from the questionnaires.

The next two questions dealt with the debate background of the judge, first asking if he was now or had ever been a debate coach, and second asking if he had ever had formal debate training. This division was designed to discover if debate coaches judge debates in the same manner or quite differently from lay judges. In addition, it gave an opportunity to compare the standards of those who had had debate training with those who had not had formal training. Formal training in debate would include those persons who were not coaches or had not taught debate, but who in school had taken part in either actual debating or debate courses.

The final question seeking information about the judge was a choice of divisions to be circled indicating the number of debates he had judged. His selection was from 0-10, 11-50, or 51 and above. The judge's experience in actually listening to a debate and determining the winner may affect his evaluation of the debate. This sectioning provided an opportunity to divide the ballots into the three experience areas to discover if there is a significant relationship between the number of debates judged and the emphasis placed on judging standards. The reason for using only the three experience divisions was that a more specific breakdown as to the actual number of debates judged would reflect little as to the criteria chosen. Any person who had judged less
than ten debates was considered a beginner at judging while a person who had judged more than fifty debates would probably be very interested in debate and would be deeply concerned with the standards for judging. Any persons between these two levels would usually have had a debate background but would not be professionally involved in debate. Only a comparison of the three divisions would reveal the relationship of the standards used by the judges of different occupations, debate orientation, and judging experience.

**Tournaments Selected for the Survey**

Having several debate tournaments available for possible investigation, certain principles had to be established to determine which tournaments would be selected. Although it was possible to send the ballots to a tournament in which North Texas State University's debate teams were not participating, it was much easier to work with a tournament if one of the North Texas coaches was there to assist in administering the special questionnaire. Second, a survey of tournaments in different regions would reflect a wider coverage of debate coaches in several regions. To provide a total of over one hundred questionnaire sheets to be tallied, four tournaments were selected for study.
Golden Spread Forensic Tournament

Each year the Chamber of Commerce in Amarillo, Texas, sponsors a tournament with the leadership of several visiting coaches. The coaches form a panel to administer the various events. Because Amarillo is in the extreme northwest corner of the state, schools from a six-state area were in attendance, with representation of twenty-seven colleges from Colorado, Wyoming, Kansas, Oklahoma, New Mexico, and Texas. Although many colleges and states were involved, the most unique aspect of this tournament is that only lay judges from the Amarillo area judge the events. From this tournament, it was then possible to study those persons who are not formally oriented in debate but who have served as a debate judge several times in this annual tournament. A total of thirty-eight debates were held in each round combining senior and junior divisions of men's and women's debates.

Baylor Invitational Forensic Tournament

The debate tournament held at Baylor University was selected for use because of the variety and size of the colleges in attendance. Thirty-nine universities and colleges in areas from California to Mississippi and from Texas to Kansas attended. The majority of teams were from larger colleges and universities though a few junior colleges were invited. With 120 debate teams competing in the men's and women's junior and senior divisions, there were sixty
debates each round. The four divisions were not equally represented; the majority of teams were in the junior men's division and the least number in senior women's division. There were four rounds of preliminary debate and four rounds of elimination debate that followed the preliminaries. The survey was conducted during one of the preliminary rounds.

Abilene Christian College Tournament

Immediately following the Baylor tournament, a third survey was taken at Abilene Christian College. The universities and junior colleges attending were from states ranging from California to Kansas, the majority of schools being from Oklahoma and Texas. The debate teams were divided into junior and senior men's division and women's division. A total of thirty debates composed each round of the preliminaries in the tournament. The majority of the judges were debate coaches of visiting teams. Each school that brought extra teams was required to furnish extra judges to help meet the demand of the additional debates. The remainder of the persons who served as judges were members of the faculty at Abilene Christian College. The other aspects of the administration of the tournament were in keeping with the other tournaments in the region.

Gulf States Invitational Tournament

The fourth tournament to be studied in the survey was the Gulf States Invitational Tournament at the University of
Southern Mississippi. Being in the south, many schools that are unable to attend some tournaments because of segregation rulings in their states were in attendance at this tournament. A total of thirty-one colleges from the ten states of Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Texas participated.

The debates were divided into senior and junior sections; the combination of the two divisions provided thirty debates for each round. The judges were composed of debate coaches from the participating colleges, "qualified" persons of the local community, and members of the faculty at the University of Southern Mississippi. The tournament was typical in its administration of events and was quite representative of other tournaments.

Recording the Results of the Special Ballot

The questionnaire ballots were divided in three ways to obtain the necessary information. The first breakdown concentrated on the occupations of the judge; the second, the experience of the judge in judging debates. The final breakdown was related to the judge's formal debate training. The number of returned ballots was high from each of the four surveyed tournaments. The following table indicates the ballots from each tournament.
A total of 139 ballots were returned from a possible total of 156. It is common practice for a few persons to refuse to answer a questionnaire; this explains the difference in the number of ballots issued and the number returned. Although some judges may simply have not filled in the information, it is important to recall that before each round in which the survey was used an announcement was made requesting judges who had already filled in the questionnaire at another tournament not to answer the second questionnaire. Since several of the same schools were in attendance at two or more of the tournaments, it is quite possible that a portion of the coaches did not return their second ballot. From this group of 139, there were 125 usable ballots. Some of the judges only partially filled in the requested material or did not fill in the proper information blanks. These ballots were not used.
Argumentation versus Debating Skills

Since one of the purposes of this study was to determine the basic philosophy of the judge in judging a debate, the difference between argumentation and debating skills was recorded. The total number of ballots were divided three times to construct the divisions of occupations, judging experience, and formal debate training. In each case, the majority of judges valued total debating skills as the primary factor in determining a debate winner. The ratio in each portion of the division remained similar. Debating skills registered just slightly over twice as many votes as did argumentation. It is significant to note that the American Forensic Association ballot was used by each judge just prior to his filling out the information for this survey. The ballot implies that all debating skills are of equal value and that each skill must be used to determine the winner of the debate. Therefore, with the strong influence that the ballot must have placed on many judges, it is interesting that almost one out of three judges still chose argumentation as more important than total debating skills in judging a debate.

Examination of the answers of those in the "argumentation" and "debating skills" groups reveals a difference in the rating of skills by each group. The thirty-six persons who indicated that the "school of argumentation" best represented their philosophy of judging tended to place greater
emphasis on the areas of analysis, refutation, and evidence than on the other skills. In the rating of debate skills, one would normally expect a judge who classified himself in the "argumentation school" to place strong emphasis on the argumentation elements. The majority of the argumentation judges maintained a strong relationship between their philosophy and the emphasis on argumentation skills; however, a few judges made only a slight degree of difference in the value placed on each of the skills in the particular debate judged. This could be possible either because he was judging a unique debate, or he was not actually in the "argumentation school." In the same way, the eighty-nine judges who indicated that they were in the "skills school" tended to place a more equal value on each of the five skills. Like those judges of the "argumentation school," a small portion of the judges demonstrated exception to their philosophy by placing a large difference between the listed skills. This difference could be because of the particular debate judged or the inconsistency of the judge's philosophy with his actual decision.

To evaluate the ratings of the judges in each division, one important observation must be made. If a judge should place a value of twenty per cent on each of the five listed skills, there would seem to be an emphasis on argumentation since three of the skills deal with argumentation. However, that particular judge would be classified as a member of the
"skills school" because of the equal value placed on each skill. Therefore, if a total rating of sixty per cent were recorded on analysis, refutation, and evidence, the judge would agree with the "skills school" philosophy.

The information discovered on the ballots checking "argumentation" or those checking "debating skills" was recorded by two methods. First, the table indicates the total percentage each of the "argumentation" ballots awarded to the areas of analysis, refutation, and evidence. Also, Table II indicates the total percentage awarded by the "debating skills" ballots to the three areas of argumentation. The same three areas were used for each school of thought so that a comparison could be made. Second, the table indicates the amount of difference recorded in the value of the lowest rated skill in contrast to the highest rated skill. For instance, if a judge had rated organization least with ten per cent and refutation highest with fifty per cent, a difference of forty per cent was recorded.

A comparison of the ballots of the two schools of thought reveals several enlightening results. First, the average percentage awarded to analysis, refutation, and evidence by the "argumentation" ballots was 71 per cent. On the same three skills, those of the "skills" school awarded an average of 64 per cent. It is clear that a definite difference existed in the weighing of the argumentation skills by the two
groups. However, the actual difference was not as large as one might expect. The averages of the two skills demonstrate the importance of all the skills but places the emphasis on argumentation.

Second, thirteen, or about one third, of the ballots in the "argumentation" school awarded the three skills approximately equal value. These judges either considered themselves in the "argumentation" school and really were not; or they did not emphasize the argumentation elements within the particular debate. Even more interesting was the fact that thirty-four of the judges in the "skills" school awarded 70 per cent or more to the elements of analysis, refutation, and evidence. These persons obviously were not in the "skills" school, or placed more than normal value on the argumentation of the debate judged.

Table II reveals that the difference in percentage value between the lowest and the highest rated skills by each of the groups of ballots was very similar. Three persons within the "argumentation" school rated all the skills equal in value and seven additional judges recognized less than 15 per cent difference between the skills. The "skills" group generally gave a more equal value to all skills but eighteen judges recognized at least a 30 per cent difference in certain skills. Table II lists the ratings of the "argumentation school" and the "skills school" ballots.
### TABLE II

**ARGUMENTATION GROUP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Judges</th>
<th>Difference in Percentages Between the Lowest and the Highest Rated Skill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100 %</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>80 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Judges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100 %</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DEBATING SKILLS GROUP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Judges</th>
<th>Difference in Percentages Between the Lowest and the Highest Rated Skill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100 %</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Judges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100 %</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In each of the divisions—occupation, experience, and training—there were approximately twice as many ballots in the "skills school" as there were in the "argumentation school." With all types of judges involved in a tournament, it was revealed that almost one third of the total debates were decided on argumentation. Therefore, it is necessary to recognize that even though argumentation was not generally accepted as the basis for determining winners, it was used by judges of different backgrounds and training. The actual difference was small between those persons who judged on argumentation and those who judged on skills. The majority of judges tended to fall between the extremes of each philosophy. Each judge designated which school best suited his concept of judging; the percentage value awarded each skill did not necessarily always reflect his belief. Most of the critic judges, however, did record values on the skills in relation to their basic belief. Table III shows the relationship of argumentation to total debating skills in each of the areas of occupation, judging, and training.

Rating the Debate Skills

By adding the percentages listed on the several ballots for each division and then dividing by the number of ballots from that particular occupation, it was possible to record an average percentage given to each of the debate skills. The figures were extended to the second digit to help compensate for the fractional difference. To help clarify the number of
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation:</th>
<th>Argumentation</th>
<th>Debating Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Debate coach</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech teacher</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate student</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businessman</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public school teacher</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewife and secretary</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td><strong>89</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judging Experience:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Judged 0-10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judged 11-50</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judged 51-above</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>35</strong></td>
<td><strong>88</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Debate Training:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No formal training</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal training</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td><strong>89</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ballots involved, the ballots used in each division were recorded beside the percentage of each skill. In this way the overall value could be determined by adding the percentages and then dividing by the number of ballots. The rating covers only the five skills listed on the ballot (analysis, refutation, delivery, evidence, and organization) plus the consideration listed as "other." Although "other" may consist of several different areas of debate, it was treated only as one area in the first recording of the information. Later a special table will explain the various skills written in by the debate judges and the relative value placed on each skill.

**Division by Occupation**

The 125 ballots that listed the occupation of the judge were divided into six divisions. The first group was composed of debate coaches who are generally considered to be the proper debate judges; the second of speech teachers who, although they may not coach debate, do have a working knowledge of the proper debate procedure. Graduate assistants were categorized because of the increasing number used as assistant coaches in several colleges. The final three divisions were composed of businessmen, public school teachers, and housewives and secretaries. Although these judges are not found in large numbers in most tournaments, they are often called upon to accommodate the extremely
large number of teams entered or to serve as alternate judges when needed.

Debate coaches.—With the combination of the four tournaments, there were twenty-three debate coaches who completed the questionnaire. In the percentages listed there was a distinct difference between the ratings of the five major skills. It is significant to note that analysis received almost one-third of the total 100 per cent. The combination of analysis and refutation accounted for over half of the value of the skills. Organization and delivery were the lowest in ratings with delivery receiving only 11 per cent of the total. Table IV shows the results of the findings on the ballots completed by debate coaches.

**TABLE IV**

**DEBATE COACHES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Total Number of Ballots</th>
<th>Total Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>31.08 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refutation</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Speech teachers.--Nineteen speech teachers completed ballots with results similar to those of debate coaches but with a slightly different emphasis. Analysis was rated high, 22 per cent, but was second to refutation with 28 per cent of the total value. Like the debate coaches, the speech teachers rated delivery lowest, averaging only 11 per cent. The speech teachers disagreed with the debate coaches by rating organization over evidence. The most important observation is that the two groups of persons in the speech profession each gave over half of the total value to analysis and refutation and placed delivery at the bottom of the list.

It is also important to realize that this group had the highest number of "other" skills of any category. The specific emphasis on the "other" skills is revealed in another table. Table V reveals the findings surveyed from the speech teachers.

**TABLE V**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Total Number of Ballots</th>
<th>Total Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22.86 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refutation</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Graduate students**—With the popular use of graduate students as a second judge for a debate tournament, the importance of this division is readily apparent. Although the graduate student is not always training to become a debate coach, he is usually working toward a master's degree in speech. The rating of the skills by graduate students was quite different from that of either the speech teachers or debate coaches. Agreeing with the first two groups, the importance was placed on refutation and analysis, with over half of the total amount in these two areas. Refutation was selected as more important than analysis. The most apparent shift in values was the importance placed on delivery. Rather than lowest, the graduate students rated delivery just below evidence and above organization in importance. With the one exception of organization below delivery, the remainder of the ratings were similar to those of the other two groups of speech teachers. The graduate students made little distinction between analysis and refutation. Although there were only ten ballots representing the basic philosophy of graduate students, a close relationship existed between the graduate students and the speech teacher. Table VI explains the results of the ballots of the graduate students.
TABLE VI
GRADUATE STUDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Total Number of Ballots</th>
<th>Total Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25.00 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refutation</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Businessmen.--Businessmen, clergymen, and lawyers completed the twenty-five ballots under the heading of "Businessmen." Ministers and lawyers who filled in ballots were not sufficient in number to demand a separate section; the businessmen were generally from the chamber of commerce and were leaders in all areas of the business world. The rating of the skills reveals that each group was more congenial than in other occupations surveyed. Unlike the speech teachers and graduate students, the businessmen did not choose analysis and refutation for half of the total value. Rather, analysis and refutation composed only 37 per cent. With the exception of evidence, all the other skills were rated almost equal in value. Table VII reports the information obtained from the group of businessmen.
TABLE VII
BUSINESSMEN, CLERGYMEN, AND LAWYERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Total Number of Ballots</th>
<th>Total Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19.76 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refutation</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Public school teachers.—This section of forty-two ballots contains the information reported by school principals, school teachers, and librarians. The majority of the ballots were filled out by elementary and secondary school principals. The unusually large number of "school teacher" judges was credited to the Golden Spread Tournament where only local citizens were judges.

Analysis and refutation, accounting for only 13 per cent of the total, were of less importance than as listed in the speech teacher occupations. This being the second time that evidence was the highest rated skill, it scored 22 per cent of the total. Delivery and organization were at the bottom of the rating with delivery being the least in importance. Table VIII explains the data recorded from the public school teacher section.
TABLE VIII
SCHOOL PRINCIPALS, SCHOOL TEACHERS, AND LIBRARIANS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Total number of ballots</th>
<th>Total percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>21.47 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refutation</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>22.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>14.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>22.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>16.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Housewives and secretaries.--The last occupational section is composed of women who are secretaries or housewives. This group was the smallest of all the judge sections, with only seven persons answering the questionnaire. Although one would not normally believe a housewife or secretary to be a qualified judge, the ballots revealed that five of the six women had received formal debate training. In rating the debate skills, the greatest emphasis was placed on evidence. Each of the three occupational sections that did not involve teaching speech placed greatest importance on evidence. The speech teachers placed less importance on evidence by rating it near the bottom in value. For the first time, analysis tied with evidence for the most important skill. Table IX shows the results of the group of housewives and secretaries.
TABLE IX
HOUSEWIVES AND SECRETARIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Total Number of Ballots</th>
<th>Total Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17.00 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refutation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Division by Experience**

Since most leaders in debate feel that one of the most important qualities of a good judge is that he have an extensive background in judging experience, it is important to examine the relationship of experience to the value placed on the debating skills. By dividing the ballots into the three areas of experience, it is possible to discover the total value placed on each skill by the judges in each experience group. In this type of breakdown, the occupations are of no real importance and are therefore combined, the only distinction in groups being those persons who have judged either 0-10, 11-50, or 51 and above debates.

**Judging experience, 0-10.**—This section of experience in judging debates refers directly to those judges who have
never judged more than ten debates. The majority of the thirty-eight judges in this group participated in the Golden Spread Tournament. Each of the skill areas were rated approximately equal in value with the exception of evidence which had a slightly higher percentage. The similarity of the value placed on each skill reflects the lack of experience in judging. The values on each skill indicate a strong contrast to the debate-oriented professions. The second area of emphasis was delivery, being the first time that delivery had been rated as important. The lowest rating was organization, although less than 6 per cent separated the first and last places. The following Table X lists the rating of the least experienced judges.

TABLE X
JUDGING EXPERIENCE, 0-10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Total Number of Ballots</th>
<th>Total Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>18.42 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refutation</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>18.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>19.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>23.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>17.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Judging experience, 11-50.—This group of judges usually consisted of those persons who had had extensive debate experience without being a debate coach. Often a judge is asked to assist with the university tournament each year and after several years he accumulates much experience. The thirty-four judges involved in this section were evenly distributed in the four tournaments. The ratings of this group reflect a position between the other two levels of the groups. First, the skills are comparatively equal in value as was shown by the choices of the less experienced judges. However, the difference that is indicated is more in keeping with the experienced judges, for in both this group and the most experienced group, analysis is rated first in importance and delivery is rated least in importance. Contrasting the more experienced group, evidence and refutation were rated equal in value. Table XI explains the results of this section.

**TABLE XI**

**JUDGING EXPERIENCE, 11-50**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Total Number of Ballots</th>
<th>Total Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>22.69 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refutation</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>21.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>15.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>21.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>17.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Judging experience, 51-above.—The judges who have the most experience in judging usually are debate coaches. With the exception of only three in this particular situation, the number of judges answering the questionnaire were either then coaching debate or had coached debate.

The results of this section were very closely related to those results in the debate-coach category. Similarly, analysis and refutation received more than half of the value placed on the skills. Evidence was placed in the middle of the skills with organization and delivery being less important. The overall comparison of the skills from the most experienced group and the debate coach group was very similar in value. The results of this section are indicated in Table XII.

TABLE XII
JUDGING EXPERIENCE, 51-ABOVE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Total Number of Ballots</th>
<th>Total Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>26.66 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refutation</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>25.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>11.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>19.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>13.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Division of Formal Debate Training

This division consisted of all the ballots received during the survey with the separation depending on the judge's debate training. Approximately one third of the judges had not had formal debate training. The major difference in the ratings of the two opposite groups is the equality of the values of the skills found on the ballots of the non-trained and the large degree of separation in the value of the skills of the group who had received training. A difference of only 7 per cent separated the first and last rated skills of the non-trained judge, while a difference of 12 per cent separated the first and last rated skills of the trained group. The non-formally trained group rated evidence as most important, while the trained judges rated evidence third.

The most important aspect of the last division is the strong relationship with the other divisions. The value placed on each skill by those receiving formal training is closely related to that recorded for the skills in the division of debate coaches, the most experienced judges. In the same manner, those persons who were not formally trained recorded information closely related to those divisions of persons in occupations not related to debate teaching.

Tables XIII and XIV demonstrate the contrast in the judgment of the person who has received formal training to that judge who has never had training in debate procedure.
### TABLE XIII

**NO FORMAL DEBATE TRAINING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Total Number of Ballots</th>
<th>Total Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>18.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refutation</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>19.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>17.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>23.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>16.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2.88%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE XIV

**FORMAL DEBATE TRAINING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Total Number of Ballots</th>
<th>Total Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>25.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refutation</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>23.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>13.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>15.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2.45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Specific Skills Added to the Questionnaire
By the Debate Judge

On the debate questionnaire given to the judges during the survey, some specific skills were added and a percentage value was given to each one. The skills written in the category "other" were not divided separately during the divisional breakdown previously discussed in this chapter. Because of the few additions to the list of skills, the percentages of each added skill would have appeared out of proportion to the other skills. The total of all the write-in skills together was of no real significance to the value placed on the five most acceptable skills. Therefore, all the added skills were totaled and used as a separate skill. The purpose of this portion of the investigation was to discover the various skills which were added by debate judges and to discover the value placed on each.

Most of the ballots used only the regular skills listed on the questionnaire in evaluating the debates. However, thirty-four of the judges chose to use some previously unmentioned skill. In general, the more familiar the judge was with debate, the more likely he was to use some additional standard for judgment. Those judges who had little experience usually accepted the standards listed and did not add any others. Any additional observations would be extremely difficult because of the variety of skills listed and the inconsistency of the type of judge listing it. It
is important that very little relationship existed between one certain skill and a single group of judges. This indicates that additional use of a specific skill was determined on personal reasons and not on the general acceptance of the importance of the skill.

It also can be observed that some skills were more often included than others. Reasoning was the most predominate skill added to the ballot. It appeared on seven ballots with an average value of just over 15 per cent. The skill appearing the most numerous times on the ballots was "overall effect" which carried an average value of 9 per cent. The least used skill was "attitude" which appeared on only two ballots but still did have a value of 5 per cent.

Table XV explains the additional skills chosen by each type of judge. The first figure appearing under each skill is the number of ballots listing the specific skill; and the second set of numbers is the average percentage awarded to the skill.

Chapter Summary

To determine important trends, the average percentage given to each skill by a certain group of judges can be compared to the average awarded by other groups of judges. It is important to recognize that in the division of judges according to the number of debates judged, definite trends are apparent. Analysis became progressively more important
TABLE XV

SPECIFIC SKILLS DESIGNATED WITHIN THE DIVISION OF "OTHER"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Divisions</th>
<th>Persuasiveness</th>
<th>Ethics</th>
<th>Reasoning</th>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>Appearance</th>
<th>Overall Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>OCCUPATIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debate coaches</td>
<td>1--10.00%</td>
<td>2-- 5.00%</td>
<td>1--20.00%</td>
<td>2-- 5.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1--10.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech teachers</td>
<td>.............</td>
<td>2--11.00</td>
<td>3--21.60</td>
<td>...........</td>
<td>2--10.00</td>
<td>2-- 7.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate students</td>
<td>.............</td>
<td>........</td>
<td>........</td>
<td>........</td>
<td>........</td>
<td>........</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businessmen</td>
<td>1--20.00</td>
<td>2--10.25</td>
<td>3-- 8.30</td>
<td>...........</td>
<td>1-- 5.00</td>
<td>........</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public school teachers</td>
<td>.............</td>
<td>2-- 7.50</td>
<td>........</td>
<td>........</td>
<td>1-- 4.00</td>
<td>7--10.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewives and secretaries</td>
<td>.............</td>
<td>........</td>
<td>........</td>
<td>........</td>
<td>........</td>
<td>........</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JUDGING EXPERIENCE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judged 0-10</td>
<td>1--20.00%</td>
<td>2-- 7.50</td>
<td>3--11.66%</td>
<td>...........</td>
<td>1--10.00%</td>
<td>5--11.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judged 11-50</td>
<td>.............</td>
<td>2-- 6.00</td>
<td>2-- 7.50</td>
<td>...........</td>
<td>1-- 4.00</td>
<td>5-- 7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judged 51-above</td>
<td>1--10.00</td>
<td>4--11.22</td>
<td>3--30.00</td>
<td>2-- 5.00</td>
<td>2-- 7.50</td>
<td>1--10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEBATE TRAINING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No formal training</td>
<td>1--20.00%</td>
<td>3-- 6.66%</td>
<td>3--11.66%</td>
<td>...........</td>
<td>1--10.00%</td>
<td>5-- 9.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal training</td>
<td>1--10.00</td>
<td>5--10.40</td>
<td>4--18.75</td>
<td>2-- 5.00</td>
<td>4-- 7.25</td>
<td>11-- 9.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
with the experience of the judge. Those judges who had judged less than ten debates awarded only an average of 18 per cent value to analysis while those judges with medium experience averaged 22 per cent value; those having judged over fifty debates averaged 26 per cent.

The same situation was true concerning refutation, with a progressively higher percentage being given as the experience of the judge increased. The exact opposite was true with delivery—the more experienced the judge the lower the percentage value. Evidence also became less important with the decreasing experience of the judge. Organization was almost equal with judges of little and medium experience, but became of even less value to those who had judged over fifty debates. The same relationship that existed with each skill according to the experience of the judge also was true in the division of formal debate training. The judge who had received formal debate training placed more emphasis on analysis and refutation. He also recorded a less significant value on delivery, evidence, and organization than did the judge who had not had formal training.

The average value placed on the skills by the judges of occupational divisions also demonstrated certain definite trends. The most important single factor is that members of the speech professions recognized more inequality in each skill than did the members of the non-speech professions. The contrast in average scores for each skill by debate
coaches, speech teachers, and graduate students was much greater than by businessmen, school teachers, and housewives. The housewife or secretary with limited debate experience tended to place an equal value on each skill and judged the debate on total debate skills. On the other end of the scale, the debate coaches placed over half of the total value just on analysis and refutation. A simple comparison of the average value placed on each skill by judges of each division is recorded in Table XVI. Immediately following in Table XVII is the important information on the background of each judging division.

It is important to recognize that not all judges based their decision on the total skills of the debaters. Almost one out of three judges awarded their decision on the basis of argumentation. The occupation of the judge had little effect on his philosophy of "issues" or "skills." Of the 125 judges answering the questionnaire, only twenty-eight gave equal value to the listed skills. By comparing the average values of the skills, it is apparent that some judges placed three times as much emphasis on one skill as on another.

The ballots revealed that even though judges believe that they can be placed in one of the two schools of thought, the actual difference is not as large as might be expected. Certain judges may believe in the importance of argumentation but awarded significant value to all the other skills. On
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Refutation</th>
<th>Delivery</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OCCUPATIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debate coaches</td>
<td>31.08%</td>
<td>21.39%</td>
<td>11.08%</td>
<td>20.54%</td>
<td>13.28%</td>
<td>2.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech teachers</td>
<td>22.56</td>
<td>28.39</td>
<td>11.71</td>
<td>15.81</td>
<td>16.07</td>
<td>5.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate students</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>28.50</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businessmen</td>
<td>19.76</td>
<td>17.76</td>
<td>18.35</td>
<td>23.56</td>
<td>17.16</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewives and secretaries</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>20.83</td>
<td>20.33</td>
<td>21.16</td>
<td>20.83</td>
<td>......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUDGING EXPERIENCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judged 0-10</td>
<td>18.42%</td>
<td>18.28%</td>
<td>19.60%</td>
<td>23.02%</td>
<td>17.36%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judged 11-50</td>
<td>22.69</td>
<td>21.36</td>
<td>15.48</td>
<td>21.36</td>
<td>17.31</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judged 51-above</td>
<td>26.66</td>
<td>25.19</td>
<td>11.23</td>
<td>19.92</td>
<td>13.90</td>
<td>2.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEBATE TRAINING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No formal training</td>
<td>18.88%</td>
<td>19.88%</td>
<td>17.88%</td>
<td>23.55%</td>
<td>16.77%</td>
<td>2.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal training</td>
<td>25.47</td>
<td>23.10</td>
<td>13.08</td>
<td>20.05</td>
<td>15.37</td>
<td>2.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE XVII

**BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON EACH JUDGING DIVISION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Divisions</th>
<th>No Formal Training</th>
<th>Formal Training</th>
<th>Judged 0-10</th>
<th>Judged 11-50</th>
<th>Judged 51-Above</th>
<th>Been a Debate Coach</th>
<th>Number of Ballots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OCCUPATIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debate coaches</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech teachers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate students</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businessmen</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public school teachers</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewives and secretaries</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUDGING EXPERIENCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judged 0-10</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judged 11-50</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judged 51-above</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEBATE TRAINING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No formal training</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal training</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the other extreme, those judges in the "skills" school may judge a debate by the total performance but recognize a certain emphasis in the area of argumentation. A difference of 8 per cent in the importance of argumentation was recorded between the two groups of judges. However, if the American Forensic Association ballot had not been used, the judges might have recorded an even greater difference.

The study clearly demonstrates that the occupation of the judge, the experience that he has had in judging debate, and whether or not he has had formal debate training definitely affects the amount of emphasis he placed on each debating skill.
CHAPTER VI
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary of the Findings

This study was made because of the lack of agreement among debate judges as to the standard by which a debate should be judged. Many forensic leaders have believed for some time that judges do not decide the winner of a debate on the same basis as debaters are taught in debate classes. Therefore, the purpose of this investigation was to determine if a relationship exists between the actual standard used by judged during a tournament and the theory taught in collegiate debate courses. It is believed that most judges base their decisions upon one of two factors: first, with the major emphasis upon the arguments presented by each team; or second, on the total debate skill of each team with most skills being approximately equal in value. The judgment based upon arguments includes the selection of arguments, refutation, and the amount of evidence used. Although other factors may be of some importance to such a judge during a debate, his emphasis is decidedly on the arguments of the team. The judgment based on the total debate skills involves the components of arguments, but having
equal value are the other skills of the debater. These additional skills may be the debater's organization of ideas, his use of language, his delivery of the speech, ethics of each team, and any other factor considered as basic debate skill.

By means of surveying the leading college textbooks of debate, debate articles in speech journals, the actual ballots of debate tournaments, and using a special questionnaire for debate judges in actual tournaments, the problems of greatest significance were selected for study. These problems were:

1. What type of person should be a debate judge?
2. What directions are given in debate textbooks for judging debate?
3. What means of evaluation are expressed in speech periodicals?
4. What methods of judging are indicated on debate ballots?
5. How do tournament judges actually determine debate winners?

**Type of Judge**

If debating is designed to serve as an educational process, and if actual debate is part of the program to train debaters, it is only natural that the best critic judge would be a debate coach. Usually it is agreeable to the schools and to the debaters to have a debate coach serve as a critic judge. There are many opinions as to the characteristics that the judge should have, but most
textbook authors agree that he should fall into one of two basic schools of thought.

First, the ideal judge is considered to be a person who knows all the technicalities of debate, knows the debate topic and is familiar with various areas of it, puts aside his personal prejudices, and does not have any close ties with the school or the debaters he is judging. He must feel that debate is an educational activity. The importance of the debate is not winning, but training in the art of persuasion.

A second basic concept in determining who should be a judge is only that he be well versed in the techniques of logic. It would mean that he should know logic thoroughly, understand the logical development of a policy question, and familiarize himself with the obligations of the affirmative and negative teams in handling a question. His major concern as a judge would be which team did the better job of argumentation. The major difference between the two approaches is that one emphasizes the argumentation of each team while the much broader approach considers argumentation but also recognizes the other aspects of debate skill.

**Textbook Philosophy of Judging Debates**

The majority of the textbooks place emphasis on total debate skill. The authors believe that the winning of an actual debate is secondary; the real importance in debate is the teaching of argumentative and persuasive skills. The
evaluation based on the skills of the debater is the only fair method since any debate topic tends to favor one side of the debate. The debate question, therefore, is only a vehicle by which the four debaters demonstrate the quality of their debate skill. The authors of the five textbooks that supported the "skills" school explained that the skills would vary from one judge to another depending on the judge's personal emphasis. The authors refrained from placing any value on any specific skills and agreed that a judge would evaluate each debate differently; therefore, the value of one particular skill would vary with each debate. In no way did the textbooks suggest a heavier weighing of argumentation by the judge. The implication was that each debate skill should be approximately equal in value. It is then possible for a team to win the arguments and lose the debate because of inferior debate skill.

The remaining three debate textbooks and a book on debate rules support the views that the team that wins the argument wins the debate. The judge is expected to keep an accurate record of the arguments presented and the refutation of each team. The judge awards the decision to the team by examining the arguments that remain unanswered after the debate has concluded. A decision of this type is determined primarily on the analysis, refutation, and evidence presented. The judge recognizes any other skill as a necessary vehicle for debate but believes strongly that the
clash of arguments is of primary concern. It is important that one third of the debate textbooks recommends the "argumentation" approach to judging a debate.

Debate Evaluation Expressed in Periodicals

The surveyed debate articles can be divided into two groups. The first group is composed of those authors who believe that the student should be judged on his ability to persuade and relate his material directly to an audience. This group was classified as the "skills" school because of its emphasis on the total performance of the student. The second group asserts that the student should be specifically judged on the development of his speech around evidence and logic. These writers were placed in the "issues" school because of their emphasis on the argumentation qualities of the student. Although the names of "skills" and "issues" were not found in any of the articles, it was evident that the long existing controversy over argumentation or total performance as more important still existed. The number of articles devoted to total performance almost equaled those articles concerned with argumentation.

Decisions as Indicated on Debate Ballots

The several types of ballots used in tournament competition confirm the fact that there is definite indecision as to the proper categories to be used by the judge. The skill areas found on ballots range from three or four items
to the elaborate ballots listing as many as nine specific areas to be used. The majority of ballots select only five or six skill areas. Each ballot failed to instruct the judge as to the method that he should use to determine his decision. The ballots listing specific debate skills did not indicate the value that should be placed on each skill. The judge could only conclude that the skills were approximately equal in value.

The instruction sheets given to judges were found to be vague and not clear in the desired method of determining the winner of the debate. Usually more space was devoted to the procedure of formal debating than to the standards for judgment. Some of the sheets indicated that argumentation should be valued higher than other areas, but no explanation was given as to how much more important it was over the other areas. The failure of debate ballots and judges' instruction sheets to explain the desired method of determining winners left the actual selection of criteria to the judge. However, the large number of ballots that listed specific debating skills implied that the final decision should be reached by a weighing of those skills.

Actual Criteria Used by Tournament Judges

The special questionnaire revealed that not all judges base their decision on the total skills of the debaters. Almost one out of three judges awards his decision on the basis of argumentation. The occupation of the judge proved
to have little effect on determining whether his philosophy tended toward "issues" or "skills." Of the 125 judges answering the questionnaire, only 28 gave equal value to the listed skills. A few judges placed three times as much weight on one skill as on another skill. The majority of judges was somewhere in between the two extremes. They placed a certain emphasis on argumentation but also considered other skills important in reaching the final decision.

A comparison of the ballots of the two schools of thought reveals several enlightening results. First, the average percentage awarded to analysis, refutation, and evidence by the argumentation ballots was 71 per cent. On the same three skills, those of the "skills" school awarded an average of 64 per cent. It is clear that a definite difference existed in the weighing of the argumentation skills by the two groups. However, the actual difference was not as large as one might expect. The averages of the two skills demonstrate the importance of all the skills but places the emphasis on argumentation.

Second, thirteen, or about one third, of the ballots in the "argumentation" school awarded the three skills approximately equal value to all the skills of debate. These judges either considered themselves in the "argumentation" school and really were not; or they did not emphasize the argumentation elements within the particular debate. Even more
Interesting was the fact that thirty-four of the judges in the "skills" school awarded 70 per cent or more to the elements of analysis, refutation, and evidence. These persons obviously were not in the "skills" school, or placed more than normal value on the argumentation of the debate judged.

To determine important trends, the average percentage given to each skill by a certain type of judge was compared to the average awarded by other groups of judges. Analysis became progressively more important with the experience of the judge. Those judges who had judged less than ten debates awarded only an average value of 18 per cent to analysis while those judges with medium experience averaged 22 per cent value; those having judged over fifty debates averaged 26 per cent. The same situation was true concerning refutation, with a progressively higher percentage being given as the experience of the judge increased. The exact opposite was true with delivery—the more experienced the judge, the lower the percentage value. Evidence also became less important with the decreasing experience of the judge. Organization was almost equal with the judges of little and medium experience but became of less value to those who had judged over fifty debates.

The same relationship that existed with each skill according to the experience of the judge also was true in the division of formal debate training. The judge who had received formal debate training placed less emphasis on
delivery, evidence, and organization than did the judge who had not had formal training.

The average percentage placed on the skills by the judges of occupational divisions also demonstrated certain definite trends. The most important single factor was that members of the speech professions recognized more inequality in each skill than did the members of the non-speech professions. The housewife or secretary with limited debate experience tended to place an equal value on each skill and judged the debate on total debate skills. On the other end of the scale, the debate coach placed over half of the total value just on analysis and refutation.

The survey of the actual criteria employed by tournament debate judges revealed that not all judges determine a debate winner in the same manner. A division can be constructed by dividing the judges into the "skills" and the "issues" schools. Most judges believe in the development of several debate skills but place emphasis on argumentation. The amount of emphasis is relative to the basic belief of the judge. Those of the "skills" school rate the skills approximately equal. Those persons of the "issues" school recognize skills other than those dealing with argumentation but place most value on the argumentation of the debate.

Conclusions

The original controversy between O'Neill and Wells continues to be expressed in the textbooks and periodicals
of debate. The difference between the two philosophies is in the approach to the purpose of debate. Those persons who believe that debate is primarily training for the student in persuasion agree that argumentation is vital but also the other skills of speaking must be included in any decision. These judges who examine all the areas of debate to determine the total effect can be considered in the "skills" school of debate. Contrasting the "skills" view, some persons believe that the major reason for debate is the training of students in argumentation. These persons believe that the other skills of debate are only vehicles to carry the arguments and that the emphasis must be placed on the students' capabilities of argumentation. Each view is expressed by both the authors of articles and textbooks and by actual judges. The majority of persons tends to believe in the "skills" approach but a significant number of writers and judges believe strongly in argumentation. The ratio of textbooks and articles encouraging the argumentation approach is closely related to the ratio of the debate judges who practiced the argumentation philosophy. In that sense, there is a direct relationship between the theoretical and the actual criteria employed by debate judges.

Tournament directors should recognize the difference in standards by judges of varying experience. If judges of limited experience are employed, the decision will not be based on the same standards as those standards of persons
well oriented in debate. No matter what type of judge is asked to decide the winners of debates, there will be a certain difference in values expressed on each ballot.

The use of a "skills" ballot has a tempering effect on the judge's standard of judgment. If a judge is asked to evaluate a debate in certain specified areas, it will tend to limit the extremist. Persons who would normally determine the winner by considering only one factor are encouraged to use a more overall approach of judging. If a judge is asked only to declare a winner, he may be encouraged to use any method for deciding the winner. The American Forensic Association ballot, by selecting the areas of analysis, refutation, evidence, organization, and delivery, does emphasize argumentation. Since three of the five areas deal directly with argumentation, a judge must place more emphasis on the arguments of the speaker.

Debate coaches placed more emphasis on analysis than any other group of judges. It is possible that analysis was rated high because the debate coach judge actually debates with the debaters. He may find himself guilty of expecting the debater to handle the debate question as he would handle it. On the other hand, because of the large number of debates heard each season, the debate coach may compare a particular debate to all other debates. If a judge involves his attitude of the debate subject, he will not evaluate the debate as it is presented.
Recommendations

Within the scope of this investigation of the theoretical and actual criteria employed by tournament judges, certain recommendations can be offered.

Debate Textbooks

1. Authors of debate textbooks should adopt a definite philosophy of judging debate. The standards for judging a debate should be clear to the reader so that the student may understand the value of the various debate skills.

2. More material should be devoted to the judging of debate to serve as a guide to the debater and the prospective debate judge.

Debate Ballots

1. The debate ballot used should clearly explain the preferred standards for determining the winner of a given debate. If only argumentation should be considered, then it should be clear to the judge. If several debate skills are preferred as a basis for judgment, the ballot should relate the value to be placed on each skill.

2. Debate directors should be strongly encouraged to use the American Forensic Association ballot to help standardize a ballot for tournament use.

3. The debate ballot should contain several skills but an emphasis should be given to argumentation.
a. Refutation should be awarded twice as much value as any other skill.

b. Argumentation should constitute 70 per cent of the total value, and organization and delivery should compose the remaining 30 per cent.

4. Space should be provided for the judge to explain the basis for his decision.

Tournament Directors

1. Tournament directors should work toward a more unified standard of judgment to be used by all judges within the particular tournament.

2. When possible, the director should arrange a meeting of all judges to be employed during the tournament and present a unified basis for debate decisions to be used in all the debate evaluations.

3. Instruction sheets should be provided for the judges (if meetings are not possible) to help explain the value to be given to each aspect of debate. The sheet should clearly explain how the judge should reach his decision.

4. The debaters should be informed as to the standards to be used by the judge in determining the winners of the debates.

5. The selected ballot should clearly explain the value of each debate skill.
6. The debate tournament should be organized so that it is possible for a judge to offer a critique for each debater and give an overall picture of his impression of the debate.

7. The director should not use anyone as a judge who is not well oriented in debate and does not have a thorough knowledge of the evaluation procedure used during the tournament.

**Future Studies**

1. A study should be made to determine the proper standard for awarding the decision to a debate team. The acceptance of a universal standard of judgment would benefit both the debate coach as well as the debate student.

2. A study should be made to construct a ballot that could be more universally accepted by tournament directors.
APPENDIX A

SPECIAL QUESTIONNAIRE FOR JUDGES

Judges often disagree on the basis for determining the winner in a competitive debate. Some base their decision entirely on \underline{ARGUMENTATION}; they decide who won the argument, virtually disregarding such factors as delivery, organization, ethics, and etc., which are frequently found on a debate ballot.

Others base their decision on \underline{GENERAL DEBATING SKILL}. They give approximately equal value to the skills that a debate should exhibit, with argumentation just one of the factors considered (although it may be the most important single factor in his judgment.) To these judges, it is possible to lose the argument and still win the debate by demonstrating superiority in overall skill.

1. Please indicate by checking which one of these two philosophies best expresses the basis for your decisions in debate.

\underline{Argumentation}: arguments selected, evidence used, and answers to opposing arguments.

\underline{Debating skills}: analysis, arguments, delivery, refutation, ethics, organization, and any other factors normally found on debate ballots.

2. Referring to \underline{THIS} debate, indicate the approximate importance you attached to each of the following factors by giving a percentage value:

\underline{\% Analysis (including selection of arguments)}

\underline{\% Refutation} \underline{COMMENTS: ____________________________}

\underline{\% Delivery} \underline{COMMENTS: ____________________________}

\underline{\% Evidence} \underline{COMMENTS: ____________________________}

\underline{\% Organization} \underline{COMMENTS: ____________________________}

\underline{\% Other.} \underline{COMMENTS: ____________________________}

Do Not sign your name or in any way reveal the identity of the judge. The person filling in this information shall remain anonymous. The information obtained will be most vital in research for a master's thesis on debate judges.

Occupation?

Are you now or have you ever been a debate coach? \underline{______________________}

Have you had formal debate training? \underline{______________________}

Number of debates judged? (Circle one) 0-10 11-50 51 and above
### APPENDIX B

#### ABILENE CHRISTIAN COLLEGE TOURNAMENT, 1964

**PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Coach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abilene Christian College</td>
<td>Ed Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baylor University</td>
<td>Glenn R. Capp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradley University</td>
<td>George Armstrong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardin-Simmons University</td>
<td>DeWitte Holland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard County Junior College</td>
<td>Martin W. Landers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas State University</td>
<td>Ted J. Barnes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lubbock Christian College</td>
<td>Bill Young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwestern University</td>
<td>Carrol Hickey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Texas State University</td>
<td>William Demougeot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odessa College</td>
<td>Wally Jackson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma Christian College</td>
<td>Glenn Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma University</td>
<td>David Berg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange State College</td>
<td>Lee E. Grannell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris Junior College</td>
<td>Mary Norment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redlands University</td>
<td>E. R. Moulton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Angelo College</td>
<td>J. E. Bouligny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest Texas State</td>
<td>William L. Corden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwestern State College</td>
<td>James Sill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen F. Austin College</td>
<td>Charles W. Wise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Southern University</td>
<td>T. F. Freeman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
College
Texas University
University of Wichita
Wayland College
West Texas State

Coach
Tom Watkins
Quincalee Brown
Henry Ramey
Gene Lewis
APPENDIX C

BAYLOR UNIVERSITY TOURNAMENT, 1964

PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS

Abilene Christian College
Arlington State College
Baylor University
Bellarmin College
Centenary College
Central State College
Hardin-Simmons Baptist College
Howard County Junior College
Lamar Technological College
Lon Morris Junior College
Loyola University
Mary Hardin-Baylor College
Midwestern State University
North Texas State University
Northeastern State College
Oklahoma Baptist College
Ouachita College
Panhandle A and M College
Texas A & M College
Rice University

San Antonio College
Southeastern State College
Southwest Texas College
Southwestern Assemblies of God College
Stephen F. Austin College
Temple Junior College
Texas Christian University
Texas Lutheran College
Tyler Junior College
University of Houston
University of the Pacific
University of Southern Mississippi
University of Southwestern Louisiana
University of Texas
University of Wichita
Wayland College
West Texas State College
Wharton County Junior College
APPENDIX D

GOLDEN SPREAD FORENSIC TOURNAMENT, 1964

PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS

College
Abilene Christian College, Abilene, Texas
Adams State, Alamosa, Colorado
Amarillo College, Amarillo, Texas
Baylor University, Waco, Texas
Bethany Nazarene, Bethany, Oklahoma
Colorado College, Colorado Springs
Colorado State, Greeley, Colorado
Eastern New Mexico, Las Vegas, New Mexico
Hardin-Simmons University, Abilene, Texas
Hutchinson Junior College, Hutchinson, Kansas
Lubbock Christian College, Lubbock, Texas
Midwestern University, Wichita Falls, Texas
North Texas State University, Denton, Texas
Odessa College, Odessa, Texas
Oklahoma City University, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma
Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma

Coach
Edward M. Brown
C. F. Harrison
Jerry McDonough
Glen Capp
E. R. Tame
James A. Johnson
D. L. Holley
Walter Brunet
DeWitte Holland
Tom Kelly
Carroll Burcham
Carroll Hickey
William Demougeot
Wally Jackson
J. D. Hoover
Fred Tewell
Otero Junior College, LaJunta, Colorado
Panhandle A. and M., Goodwell, Oklahoma
Southern Colorado State, Pueblo, Colorado
Texas Christian University, Fort Worth, Texas
Texas Technological College, Lubbock, Texas
University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado
University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, New Mexico
University of Wyoming, Laramie, Wyoming
Wayland College, Plainview, Texas
West Texas State College, Canyon, Texas
Western State College, Gunnison, Colorado

R. Reyes
Richard Walther
L. P. Dudley
Dave Metheny
Jim Hobbins
R. V. Harnack
Jack Gravlee
Jerry Davies
Henry Romey
Gene Lewis
Ted Johnson
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### PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Coach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas State College, Jonesboro, Arkansas</td>
<td>John Benton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centenary College, Shreveport, Louisiana</td>
<td>Ruth Alexander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Methodist College, Fayette, Missouri</td>
<td>Bruce Wilkinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clemson College, Clemson, South Carolina</td>
<td>Arthur Fear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emory University, Atlanta, Georgia</td>
<td>Glenn Pelham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freed-Hardeman College, Henderson, Tennessee</td>
<td>James Swinney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinds Junior College, Raymond, Mississippi</td>
<td>Fred Brooks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones County Junior College, Ellisville, Mississippi</td>
<td>Elton Bateman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana College, Pineville, Louisiana</td>
<td>Charles Parker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana</td>
<td>Paul Barefield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana Technological, Ruston, Louisiana</td>
<td>Paul Pennington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memphis State University, Memphis, Tennessee</td>
<td>Norma Cox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Tennessee State, Murfreesboro, Tennessee</td>
<td>David Arnold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millsaps College, Jackson, Mississippi</td>
<td>Ed Collins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi College, Clinton, Mississippi</td>
<td>Hollis Todd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi State College for Women, Columbus, Mississippi</td>
<td>Harvey Cromwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>Coach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi State University, Starkville, Mississippi</td>
<td>Brad Bishop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Texas State University, Denton, Texas</td>
<td>William DeHouseot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern State College, Natchitoches, Louisiana</td>
<td>Don Graham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perkinston College, Perkinston, Mississippi</td>
<td>Philip Lisetta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeastern State College, Hammond, Louisiana</td>
<td>Win Welford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest Junior College, Summit, Mississippi</td>
<td>Olive Hay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Hill College, Mobile, Alabama</td>
<td>Bettie Hudgens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, Arkansas</td>
<td>Bob Deutsch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia</td>
<td>Merwyn Hayes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of South, Sewanee, Tennessee</td>
<td>Ralph Marsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Southern Mississippi, Hattiesburg, Mississippi</td>
<td>Ben Chappell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee</td>
<td>Joe Moriarty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Georgia College, Carrollton, Georgia</td>
<td>Nelson Carpenter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Carey, Hattiesburg, Mississippi</td>
<td>Mary Treseer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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