

379
N81
No. 6322

LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE
IN THE STATE
OF TEXAS

THESIS

Presented to the Graduate Council of the
North Texas State University in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

By

Laura B. Baxter, B.A.

Denton, Texas

May, 1986

99

Baxter, Laura B., Lincoln-Douglas Debate in the State of Texas. Master of Arts (Communication), May, 1987, 100 pp., 5 tables, bibliography, 55 titles.

This study traces the development of Lincoln-Douglas debate in Texas. The history of this type of debate from the Great Debate between Abraham Lincoln and Stephen Douglas to the Reagan-Mondale debates is considered. In addition, the merits of this type of oral controversy are explored.

The reasons for the creation of L-D debate and its introduction into the forensic curriculum are discussed. In order to measure L-D's growing acceptance in the debate community, the results of a questionnaire of Texas Forensic Association debate coaches is evaluated.

This study found that L-D debate is growing in participation in Texas schools. The distinct features of L-D enable it to be an innovative and challenging form of discourse.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES iv

Chapter Page

I. INTRODUCTION TO THE PROBLEM 1

 Statement of the Problem

 Significance of the Study

 Scope of the Study

 Methodology

 Plan of Reporting

II. THE HISTORY AND MERITS OF L-D DEBATE. 20

III. SURVEY RESULTS AND DISCUSSION 60

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 77

APPENDIX A 84

APPENDIX B 90

APPENDIX C 92

WORKS CONSULTED. 96

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Sizes of Forensic Programs	61
II. Tournament Attendance, Budget and TFA Membership Information	62
III. Number of Tournaments Attended Compared to the Size of the Squads	63
IV. Team Debate and L-D Debate Attendance, Coach Competition Experience, and Interest Increase in L-D	64
V. Interest Factors for L-D Debate	65

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION TO THE PROBLEM

Debate is an essential component in a free society. The advocating of sharply defined sides or opinions is an activity our citizens enjoy called debate. From courtrooms to legislative bodies, decisions are made supported by the clash of opinions, values, and facts. Lawyers, both criminal and civil, present and argue opposite viewpoints. Likewise, as in the days of Webster and Calhoun, national policies are set through debates in congress. From political campaigns to everyday decisions, individuals make critical judgments based upon their competency to discern worthy ideas and reject invalid concepts.

In addition, the ability to measure the soundness of thought is often developed through the training provided to those persons involved in the activity of debate, for the educational value of this forensic endeavor is immeasurable. Critical thinking, along with research and analysis skills, enable the student of argumentation to engage in a unique experience in learning. In their book, Argumentation and the Decision Making Process, Rieke and Sillars comment on the values of debate instruction within the schools.

Recently specialists in pedagogy have announced what they believe to be exciting, new

approaches to education--simulation and gaming. They find that education that simulates those life experiences being taught tends to be more meaningful and appealing to the students. Furthermore, they suggest that if the simulation can be put in some kind of game format, the excitement of competition will motivate students to greater involvement in the educational process. Those knowledgeable in educational debate can only smile at such announcements, for simulation and gaming have been characteristics in their field for over 2000 years! (277)

In the classroom, debate offers real-world preparation for resolving conflict and stimulating reasoning abilities. Through the study of debate, students learn to practice analytical thinking and the effective use of proof. Austin Freeley observes that, "As an educational method, debate provides excellent motivation for learning . . ." (20); in fact, forms of public discourse focus attention upon fundamental issues as does the activity of debate.

In recent years a special type of debate has emerged in the schools. Involving one person, Lincoln-Douglas debate was named for the famous contests held in 1858 between Abraham Lincoln and Stephen A. Douglas. The Kennedy-Nixon debates of 1960, the Ford-Carter debates of 1976, the Carter-Reagan debates of 1980, and the Reagan-Mondale debates of 1984, all employed the format of

one-person debate with an "emphasis placed on logical reasoning, philosophy, and theory" (Newcombe 171). Begun in 1980, Lincoln-Douglas debate is offered in the forensic programs of many Texas high schools. Fryar and Thomas describe L-D debate as "a completely new event that has merits and characteristics of its own" (3). Due to Lincoln-Douglas debate's educational merits, a study of its history and growth in Texas high schools is warranted.

Statement of the Problem

The reasons for the growing acceptance of Lincoln-Douglas debate are numerous. Team cross-examination debate is generally accepted as a worthy activity. In the last five years, however, one-on-one argumentation contests have become not only acceptable, but in many Texas schools, the only form of debate taught.

This study will answer the following questions:

1. What are the reasons for the introduction of L-D debate into Texas forensic curricula?
2. Has the number of contests offering Lincoln-Douglas debate increased in Texas? If so, what factors account for the increase?
3. If an increase in Lincoln-Douglas participation is occurring, is two-person debate participation decreasing?
4. Is there a trend to replace team debate with Lincoln-Douglas debate?

To answer these questions, this study will trace the development of Lincoln-Douglas debate in forensic programs in Texas and seek to determine its values and the reasons for its growth.

Definitions

In a study of this type, several terms need to be defined. "Debate" will be defined as "a specific situation in which the procedure of argumentation is employed to reach decisions" (Patterson and Zarefsky 12). When argumentation is conducted in a formalized setting, debate takes place. A specific subject and speaking times are usually set ahead of time. A neutral third party is the decision-maker, and this element is ". . . perhaps the most important feature of debate" (12).

In a debate, the speakers present their ideas through the use of argumentation. "Argumentation" shall be defined as:

The study and/or use of argument, consisting of the dual process of discovering the probable truth of an issue through appropriate logical, ethical, and persuasive techniques. (Fryar and Thomas 195)

Debate and argumentation are closely linked. Argumentation is the method used to reach decisions, and debate is ". . . the arena in which the general principles of argumentation can be applied" (Patterson and Zarefsky 12).

Another essential aspect of this study involves the employment of two kinds of statements used in the topic selection for a debate. A "policy proposition" will describe ". . . a statement offered for consideration of a course of action, or a law, designed to guide present and future decisions" (Fryar and Thomas 16). This kind of topic is used by high school two-person debate teams. The debaters seek to find the best course of action and

argue the merits of the proposed plan. The second type of statement is "value proposition." This statement is concerned with whether something is good or desirable. Fryar and Thomas explain this question as dealing with the quality of something. Moral, artistic, political, and utilitarian values are the qualities used most often in debating propositions of value (8-14).

Lincoln-Douglas debaters employ this kind of statement.

Lincoln-Douglas debate, hereafter referred to as L-D debate, is a style of debate involving only two debaters, one on each side of the question to be debated. Since L-D focuses on propositions of value, the conflict is one of differences in value judgments. Each L-D debater presents a value which is upheld and supported throughout the debate. The decision always hinges upon the weighing of each L-D debater's value. Often an L-D debater will structure the case with a criteria set. These criteria assert that the value supported by the case is the ultimate human need. Another distinct characteristic of L-D debate involves the number of topics debated each year. In L-D, participants argue several different topics throughout the year. "In Texas, a committee of the Texas Forensic Association selects several topics of debate for the L-D contests. In other areas they are selected by the school hosting the tournament" (Grice and Knaak 3). The final characteristic of L-D involves the format. The order of speeches in L-D debate and the maximum times for speaking during each speech are determined before the contest; moreover, these time limits for L-D are shorter than those for two-person debate.

David Thomas in his book, Lincoln-Douglas Debate, explains the time allocation and speaking order for L-D.

Each side has an equal amount of time in the debate, but the time is allocated in a different fashion from the traditional cross-examination debate. Speeches and rebuttals are all of unequal lengths. . . . The order of speakers and time limits for each section of the debate is as follows:

Affirmative-- 6 minute constructive speech

Negative-- 7 minute constructive speech

Affirmative-- 4 minute rebuttal

Negative-- 6 minute rebuttal

Affirmative-- 3 minute rebuttal. (3)

Two-person or team debate is the other type of debate taught in Texas schools and is an activity widely used in interscholastic competition. This type of debate also has its own components. First, a team consists of two members who are prepared to defend both sides of the topic with specific time limits. The second major characteristic of two-person debate is that it is team policy debate which uses the national debate topic for the entire year. The propositions ". . . propose a rule, regulation, or law to govern decisions within a designated problem area" (Fryar and Thomas 20). Employing the contention that something should or should not be done, these two-person debaters solicit a policy decision from a judge. "A ruling in favor of one side or

the other would result in policy either being changed or not changed" (Schanker 279).

Furthermore, great attention is placed upon the importance of extensive research in two-person debate. In A High School Debater's Manual, the value of research is addressed. "Research is becoming increasingly important to interscholastic debate as public policy questions become more complex and sources of information continue to proliferate. . . . Research is central to the whole process of interscholastic debate" (Balthrop 13). By debating the proposition for a year, the two-person debate team can amass the extensive amount of evidence necessary for successful competition with this style of debating.

In addition, each side in a two-person debate has clearly defined objectives. The affirmative must present an example of the resolution (i.e. a plan), show a reason for change, and prove that adoption of the proposition would be advantageous. The negative, on the other hand, can use a variety of options, each of which is designed to deny the need for the specific resolution and/or to show that disadvantages exist to the affirmative plan (Fryar and Thomas 52-63).

L-D debate and two-person cross-examination debate are both high school competitions. Their counterparts on the collegiate level are Cross-Examination Debate Association (CEDA) debate and National Debate Tournament (NDT) debate. Like L-D, CEDA debate has a strong emphasis on communication and persuasion (Howe 1). Unlike L-D debate however, CEDA has two team members, and the

topic only changes twice per year (Freeley 33). The National Debate Tournament is an organization comprised of students from colleges throughout the nation who participate in academic policy debate. NDT debate very much resembles high school two-person debate. Teams debate one topic all year and place a high priority on evidence. Each side has specific responsibilities, and the format of time constraints are similar to high school two-person debate teams.

Significance of the Study

A study of L-D debate in Texas high schools is needed for several reasons. First, in planning the curriculum, the forensic coach can gain from the knowledge of why students are involved in L-D debate. L-D's approach to research and audience involvement directs the plans and teaching techniques of the instructor. Since the topic changes during the year and the types of propositions debated require value judgments, the emphasis in L-D is placed more on reasoning than on evidence. "L-D emphasizes the explanation of fewer arguments . . ." (Grice and Knaak 3). This aspect of L-D is important to the curriculum of a debate program.

Another characteristic of L-D debate involves the audience. In 1980, L-D was developed in an effort to relate debate to its listeners, to be more communicative. The L-D debater is trained to appreciate the audience as intelligent, while at the same time trying to maintain a balance "of evidence and argument, organization and delivery as elements of persuasion" (Grice and Knaak 4).

When the forensic program stresses the students' delivery skills and audience analysis, the debate teacher must be ready to adapt and be willing to plan for the students' needs.

An educator also desires to know what each activity can offer to the program's success. If L-D debate fulfills an essential element in the forensic coaches' curriculum, this instruction should be noted. In Lincoln-Douglas Debate Handbook, L-D's value to the forensic coach is explored. "It [L-D] offers the debate coach an event that is just complex enough to challenge the advanced debater yet simple enough to interest the novice debater" (Adkins and Masters 3). This project will determine what L-D can give to a forensic program and its impact upon debate curriculum.

Second, a consideration of the unique role one-person debate can play in the training of today's debater is useful. On a personal level, the value to the student is important to note. Adkins and Masters observe that L-D was created ". . . in an attempt to offer an activity embracing the ideals of good communication with scholarly research" (2). These educational values can intensify the interest of students and serve to enhance the forensic pupil's education. If the development of critical thinking and the evaluation of values is inherent in L-D debate, L-D's benefits to the student are of paramount importance to this study.

Third, if a trend toward L-D debate is taking place in the high school, consideration of the possible ramifications is

relevant to the future of oral controversy. Grice and Knaak contend that C.E.D.A. debate and L-D debate were created as alternatives to two-person cross-examination debate which places a strong emphasis on evidence (4). The originator of C.E.D.A., Jack H. Howe, describes this form of debate as ". . . a variance with NDT debate in three major aspects: 1) in its attitude toward evidence; 2) in delivery techniques; and 3) in its emphasis on an audience-oriented approach to debate" (Howe 1). These differences also exist between team and L-D debate, thus accentuating some of the values of L-D, and dictating study.

Clearly, understanding the reasons for student and teacher response and ascertaining the future role of L-D debate in the forensic community is salient to teachers of debate.

Scope of the Study

This study is concerned with the activity known as Lincoln-Douglas debate. Two-person cross-examination debate will be discussed only for clarification and will not be studied. An assessment will be made of the reasons for the increased interest in L-D in Texas high schools only. College debate is not included in this inquiry. In addition, both public and private institutions in the state of Texas will be considered. The survey and information dealing with L-D debate focus only upon Texas schools and Texas forensic coaches.

Review of the Literature

Since its inception in 1980, little has been written on the topic of Lincoln-Douglas debate. Most textbooks in argumentation acknowledge policy versus value debating, while a few focus upon the activity of L-D itself. No doctoral dissertations or master's theses are written on the subject of L-D. The review of the literature does, however, provide an historical perspective of one-person debating. Journal articles center upon the values of this type of argumentation and come close to predicting the reasons for the fascination of high school students with this form of debate.

Books

A few books have been written about how to debate value propositions. Those texts dealing specifically with Lincoln-Douglas debate attempt to explain how to analyze and research a topic, the duties of the affirmative and negative speakers, cross-examination, and fallacies in reasoning.

One of the most useful texts written specifically about L-D was written by Maridell Fryar and David A. Thomas. Student Congress and Lincoln-Douglas Debate focuses upon the nature and purpose of L-D, while also considering values, cases, proofs, and delivery. This book, while not directly addressing the increase in interest of L-D, explores the values of one-person debate.

Another worthwhile text devoted solely to L-D was composed by David A. Thomas. Written as a guide to introduce L-D theory

and technique to the beginning debate coach, Lincoln-Douglas Debate succinctly presents the basics of L-D. Thomas' analysis of the stock issues in a value debate makes this particular text unique (11-14). In agreement with this writing, Lincoln-Douglas for Novices presents many of the same concepts (Grice and Knaak). The study is developed in greater depth and is adept at examining the fundamentals of L-D.

The most recent book on L-D is the Lincoln-Douglas Debate Handbook. Jointly written by Carl Adkins and J. E. Masters in 1985, the book makes a significant contribution to information dealing with previously printed material plus research advice and data involving tournament competition. This writing provides a more advanced analysis of the activity of L-D. While not specifically focusing on the growth of L-D, the chapter on purpose considers some possible reasons for entering the activity (2-3).

The remaining texts concerned with L-D consider values. The Value Debate Handbook delves into American values while linking these values to objects of evaluation (Polk, English, Walker 58). This research is much like a debate handbook used by two-person debate teams, for it has evidence and briefs. Robert Kemp in his publication, Lincoln-Douglas Debate, a Text for the Interschool Debater, also notes a great deal of analysis upon values and strategies involving the L-D debater.

Thus, while books in this area give readers a basic background into L-D's history, nature, and strategies, no attempt has been made to specifically study L-D in Texas, determine its

increase in interest, or to assess why this development is occurring.

Journal Articles

While no articles deal specifically with L-D debate in Texas, they do provide a much greater insight into the values of Lincoln-Douglas debate as well as its rationale. One of the most enlightening commentaries is, "A Step Toward Sanity," by Dennis Winfield, Executive Secretary of the National Forensic League (NFL). Winfield, the originator of L-D, clarifies the motives behind the start of one-person debate on the high school level (7-8).

In The Rostrum, a magazine published by the National Forensic League, a number of valuable expositions on Lincoln-Douglas debate are presented. A series of articles published in 1983 extoll the values of one-person argumentation. "The Analysis of Value Propositions and Values," attempts to explain the classification of ideals in life (Miller 4-7). The high school debate coach and his student illustrate desirability of this type of oral discourse. Another beneficial article on values is given by Ronald J. Matlon. He has an analysis system that sets L-D debate completely apart from team debate (Matlon 203).

In an effort to mark the launching of Lincoln-Douglas debate, The Rostrum published its announcement in "From the Executive Secretary," in 1979. Winfield defines L-D and sets forth its purposes (Winfield 2-3). Providing even more in-depth analysis

about L-D, The Rostrum has many more expositions concerning its value, purpose, and future (Pinkus 4-5; Miller 10-12). Furthermore, the success of the first NFL Lincoln-Douglas debate institute was acclaimed for its advancements of one-person debate. The instructors were satisfied that "the use of value criteria, the use of the works of noted philosophers, and Lincoln-Douglas principles" (Odom 4) were understood by the workshop participants.

Thus, journal articles in this area focus upon many of the same ideas found in the earlier books. The world of L-D debate is rapidly changing, and coaches are attempting to make their voices heard especially through journal articles.

Methodology

In determining the rationale of debaters' involvement in L-D, four steps were used. First, the value of the debate form itself was viewed through a review of its history and reasons for its inception. The desired benefits of this type of debating provide a strong foundation for its desirability in the forensic community.

Second, Lincoln-Douglas' educational and real-world worth was considered through an examination of its principles and strategies. The usefulness of understanding life's values and the challenging study of persuasion were linked to the far-reaching merits of L-D debate.

Third, in an attempt to determine the attitude of Texas

debate teachers toward the activity of Lincoln-Douglas debate, a questionnaire was given to the coaches at two Texas speech tournaments, R.L. Turner High School and Plano Senior High School. These contests were Texas Forensic Association [TFA] Qualifying tournaments. In addition, letters were sent to all TFA coaches who did not attend these tournaments. The teachers were asked to answer the survey and return it either by mail or in person. The information desired was in the areas of (a) size of speech team, (b) participation in team and one-person debate, (c) tournament attendance, and (d) measurement of interest in L-D and why. A copy of the survey is found in Appendix A.

Finally, an analysis was made of Texas Forensic Association Tournaments and Lincoln-Douglas debate participation. The number of tournaments only offering L-D were noted, and a comparison of this number was made with the team debate entries. The number of L-D entries at the State Tournament over the past two years were compared. The participation of forensic students in University Interscholastic League team and L-D debate was also analyzed.

This method of studying the problem is appropriate for several reasons. First, a study of why L-D was created reveals much about the needs of the high school forensic world. The understanding of what has happened in the past is necessary for comprehending the advancements of L-D in the future. Second, the study of what L-D can offer to the student of argumentation can disclose why the high school debater finds this form of debate challenging and worthwhile.

A survey of the TFA coaches' opinions toward L-D debate enables the researcher to discover what the attitudes of the high school teachers are toward one-person debate. In addition, the forensic teacher is the best individual to know why interest in L-D is increasing on the forensic squad. The reason for selecting Texas Forensic Association members for this study is because of this organization's participation and commitment to the activity of L-D. In an effort to poll all areas of Texas, questionnaires were sent to every member of TFA. The two targeted tournaments for surveys were selected because of their widespread attendance [R. L. Turner High School: 42 schools; Plano Senior High School: 58 schools].

Finally, in order to measure contest involvement in L-D, a breakdown of one-person entries for TFA tournaments was essential. Students include themselves in activities they deem worthy, and coaches enter their students in the competitive endeavors to which they are committed. By determining the number of contestants over the past years, this investigation is better able to make a prognosis about L-D's acceptance and popularity in Texas schools.

Plan of Reporting

In this examination of Lincoln-Douglas debate in Texas high schools, Chapter II will trace the development of Lincoln-Douglas argumentation and will describe and explain the values to be gleaned from this type of discourse. Chapter III will present a

compilation of the results and will analyze a questionnaire given to Texas debate coaches. An assessment of the coaches' attitudes reflected in the survey, the statistics of entry interest in TFA qualifiers, and the reasons for involvement in the activity of one-person debate will then be evaluated.

Finally, Chapter IV will present the conclusions of this study and propose recommendations for future research.

WORKS CITED CHAPTER I

- Adkins, Carl, and J. E. Masters. Lincoln-Douglas Debate Handbook. Austin: U. I. L. Div. of Cont. Ed., 1985.
- Balthrop, Bill and Donn W. Parson. A High School Debater's Manual. Lawrence: Div. of Cont. Ed., 1978.
- Freeley, Austin J. Argumentation and Debate. Belmont: Wadsworth, 1981.
- Fryar, Maridell, and David A. Thomas. Basic Debate. Skokie: National Textbook, 1981.
- . Maridell, and David A. Thomas. Student Congress and Lincoln-Douglas Debate. Skokie: National Textbook, 1981.
- Grice, George L., and Edwin W. Knaak, Jr. Lincoln-Douglas for Novices. San Antonio: The Texas Group, 1985.
- Howe, Jack H., et al., eds. "CEDA's Objectives: Lest We Forget." Contributions on the Philosophy and Practice of CEDA. Cross Exam. Debate Assoc., 1981.
- , et al., eds. "Debate Should be a Laughing Matter". CEDA Yearbook. Cross Exam. Debate Assoc., 1982.
- Kemp, Robert L. Lincoln-Douglas Debating. Clayton: The Study Group, 1983.
- Matlon, Ronald J. "Debating Propositions of Value." Journal of the American Forensic Association 14 Spring, 1978: 194-204.

- Miller, Timothy M. and Tim Sommers. "Lincoln-Douglas Debate is 'Debate'." The Rostrum 57 Jan. 1983: 10-12.
- . "The Analysis of Value Propositions and Values." The Rostrum 57 Mar. 1983: 4-7.
- Newcombe, P. Judson. Communicating Message and Meaning.
Lexington: Ginn, 1982.
- Odom, Albert. "N F L Lincoln-Douglas Debate Institute." The Rostrum 59 Nov. 1984: 4.
- Patterson, J. W., and David Zarefsky. Contemporary Debate.
Boston: Houghton, 1983.
- Pinkus, Craig. "Are We Teaching Debaters Good Communication Skills?" The Rostrum 59 Dec. 1984: 4-5.
- Polk, Lee. R., William B. English, and Erik Walker. The Value Debate Handbook. Waco: Baylor Briefs, 1985.
- Rieke, R. and M. Sillars. Argumentation and the Decision Making Process. New York: Harcourt, 1981.
- Schanker, Harry H. The Spoken Word. New York: McGraw, 1982.
- Thomas, David A. Lincoln-Douglas Debate. Kansas City:
National Fed. of State H. S. Assocs., 1981.
- Winfield, Dennis. "A Step Toward Sanity." The Rostrum 54
Jan. 1980: 7-8.
- . "From the Executive Secretary." The Rostrum 54 Dec.
1979: 2-3.

Chapter II

THE HISTORY AND MERITS OF L-D DEBATE

In 1858, a series of debates were held in Illinois which captured the attention of the entire United States. These Great Debates enabled the political candidates, Stephen Douglas and Abraham Lincoln, to campaign before the voters in a unique way. The concept of the confrontation was initiated by Abraham Lincoln when he issued a challenge to Senator Stephen Douglas to this series of debates. Both men were seeking the senate seat in Illinois, and they had planned to campaign vigorously in order to gain the support of the voters. As the incumbent, Douglas carefully considered the values of debating Lincoln, who at the time was a lesser known political contestant. Douglas accepted Lincoln's invitation to debate with the following conditions:

- [1] They would meet in the seven congressional districts where they had not previously appeared.
- [2] The seven debates would be limited to three hours each with the first speaker being allotted one hour followed by an hour and a half of negative speaking and concluded by a thirty-minute speech from the first speaker.
- [3] Senator Douglas was to present the first

speech (when they met initially at Ottawa) and insisted that he provide the last refutation at the final debate in Alton on October 15. (Kemp 3,4)

The debates were well attended. David Zarefsky notes that crowds "ranging from 2,000 to 20,000" gathered to hear these debaters present their positions on the major issues of the day (165). Their arguments, along with their clash of ideas and reasoning, combined to make these historic debates worthy of study.

These debates captured the attention of the voters of Illinois for several reasons. Faced with a decision of electing a state senator, the people were intensely interested in what these politicians were going to say. Their desire to hear the issues eloquently presented involved first of all an attraction to the debates themselves. Frank Dennis in his book, The Lincoln-Douglas Debates, explains this idea.

Their most compelling interest was to witness what was certain to be a memorable event and in a sense to be a part of that event. They would be witnesses to a bloodless duel between the two most able stump speakers of their day. Such public speaking provided entertainment as well as enlightenment for people cut off from easy access to recreation and information. . . . A face-to-face debate between candidates, or a 'forensic duel,' . . . was a kind of show like a state fair or a horse race.

Being both entertaining and instructive, it was an important event in any community. (6, 7)

In addition, the politicians themselves created a special fascination for the voters. On the one hand, Douglas was well-known as the national proponent of Democratic ideals. Nicknamed "Little Giant," Douglas made a formidable opponent for any political contest (Dennis 7-8). Lincoln, called "Honest Abe," championed the Republican cause. He "was well known only in Illinois--the up-and-coming challenger and the state's leader of the strong new Republican party" (Dennis 7). These interesting political personalities, therefore, drew great crowds of listeners, based on the voters' attraction to the speakers themselves.

Perhaps the most important reason for voter attendance involved the magnitude of the issues being debated. The Great Debates' questions were varied; however, three major areas of contention became the focus of concern in the arguments. In his book, Lincoln Douglas Debating, Robert Kemp considers the issues facing both Lincoln and Douglas. He finds their argumentation to revolve around the electorate's right to choose or reject slavery within each province, the practicality of a national policy on slavery, and the power of the Supreme Court (6-8).

Stephen Douglas, the Democratic candidate, was a proponent of popular sovereignty. He strongly felt that each state had the right to decide its own involvement in the question of slavery. Douglas contended that "the question is not the right or wrong of slavery but how the question is decided" (Kemp 6). On the other

hand, Abraham Lincoln, the Republican candidate, countered this position in the first debate. In the book, Abraham Lincoln: The Man Behind the Myths, Stephen B. Oates analyzes the stances taken by each debater. On this issue, he reports that Lincoln "openly and fiercely declaimed his antislavery sentiments" (71). Linking the Negro to the Declaration of Independence, Lincoln interpreted the equality of man as entitling all persons to natural rights. Firmly arguing that the states and territories have no right to decide for themselves on the issue of slavery, he purported that the Constitution guarantees freedom to all men (7). The two groups opposing slavery were divided into abolitionists, those who desired immediate freedom for the Negro, and the moderates, those who accented to the immorality of slavery but did not propose emancipation or any program to eradicate it from those states where it already existed. The moderates supported the plan "to confine (slavery) to where it then existed and to hope that time and the course of events would extinguish it" (Dennis 8). Lincoln, as the moderates' representative, backed this stand on slavery. On October 15, the debaters met for the seventh and final debate in Alton, Illinois. In The Living Lincoln, an excerpt from Lincoln's last speech summarizes his position as a moderate.

The real issue in this controversy--the one pressing upon every mind--is the sentiment of the part of one class that looks upon the institution of slavery as a wrong, and of another class that

does not look upon it as a wrong. . . . One of the methods of treating it as a wrong is to make provision that it shall grow no larger. (Angle and Miers 279)

In June of 1858, the Republicans selected Abraham Lincoln as their candidate for the senate seat in Illinois. After his nomination, Lincoln took his stand on the feasibility of the nation establishing a slavery policy encompassing all the states. This speech became the famous "A House Divided" declaration (Angle and Miers 211). Robert Kemp explains this issue: "The essence was that a nation might fall if it were divided half slave and half free" (7). Douglas maintained once again that uniformity was not essential to the union. In fact, the biography, Abraham Lincoln by Benjamin P. Thomas, reports Douglas' feeling that the state autonomy constituted the nation's strength (182). Lincoln, on the other hand, never wavered from his view expressed in his acceptance speech, "A house divided against itself cannot stand" (Angle and Miers 212).

The last notable issue debated in these Great Debates was whether decisions of the Supreme Court can be questioned. This area of dissention was directly caused by the Supreme Court ruling on the Dred Scott case. Zarefsky explains that this opinion by the Court was the first time ". . . significant policy consequences from a decision . . ." had been rendered (169). In his analysis of this case's outcome, Zarefsky further states the impact of such a declaration upon the debates. On the one side,

Lincoln, while accepting ". . . the Court's specific judgment that Dred Scott, being a slave, was not a citizen and had no standing to sue . . . rejected the broad implications of the decision as a rule of political action" (169). Desiring the people to make this ruling, Lincoln adamantly argued against the court's position. Conversely, Douglas supported the court's decision. Not wanting anarchy, he argued that ". . . the Court was the final arbiter of Constitutional matters" (169). This issue was argued throughout the seven debates. The voters found Douglas painting Lincoln as an agitator who contented himself to review each court decision, while Lincoln attempted to show Douglas as a politician who accepted any court ruling, moral or immoral. In the first joint debate, Lincoln stated the following about Douglas:

He does not give any opinion . . . because it has been decided by the court, and being decided by the court, he is, and you are bound to take it in your political action as law--not that he judges at all its merits, but because a decision of the court is to him a 'Thus saith the Lord'. (Angle and Miers 250)

The voters' response to the Great Debates was overwhelming. Biographer, Benjamin Thomas, found the debates to be the "highlight" of the campaign, as thousands came to listen to speeches for three hours at a time (184). The cities of Ottawa, Freeport, Jonesboro, Charleston, Galesburg, Quincy, and Alton

were the locations of the verbal confrontations. Never before had the nation had the opportunity to hear two politicians discuss so eloquently the issues of the state and consequently the union (Miers 63-69). Both men were acclaimed speakers. Miers describes Douglas in his biography, Abraham Lincoln in Peace and War, as "a small man, but forceful and ambitious. . . . His years in Washington gave Douglas polish, confidence, a sense of destiny" (63). Physically, Stephen Douglas cut an image a voter could admire. The Living Lincoln found Douglas broad shouldered with a massive chest. He spoke with a "deep musical voice [which] conveyed an impression of strength and sturdiness" (Angle and Miers 243). On the other hand, Lincoln was slender and tall with a "thin, high-pitched voice" that commanded the attention of his audiences (Miers 63). Interspersing humor with their arguments, both candidates exhibited a speaking style commanding enough to keep their audiences interested for hours (Kemp 24).

In these Great Debates a special relationship existed between the debaters and their audiences. The accounts of their debates note the interaction of the listeners as quite active. Interjections like "Hurrah for Lincoln," "They are all good speeches," and "Hit him again," are recorded. Furthermore, audience reactions observing "great applause," "tremendous applause," "laughter," and "renewed laughter" are printed within the transcripts of the debates (Angle and Miers 268-269).

The Lincoln Douglas debates of 1858 impacted the country in

several ways. First, the debates are an historical landmark in campaigning. Newspaper reporters covered each of the debates, commenting on the stands the candidates presented. Frank L. Dennis in his study concerning the debates commented, "For the first time in American history, political speeches were recorded verbatim by means of the newly devised shorthand. What each man said to the thousands who heard him was reported to the newspapers for millions to read" (63). Never before in campaigning had the public been so informed as to the candidates' platforms. The stenographic reporting as well as the telegraph enabled the newspapers to present the politicians' views right up to the election day for the first time (Dennis 63).

Second, the debates demonstrate that audiences are interested in debating and will respond favorably to this activity (Kemp 38). Debate provides the kind of competition which measures the acumen of its speakers, as noted in the book, Abraham Lincoln in Peace and War. Not only did the debates make Lincoln's name better known, but his reasoning and knowledge of the issues impressed the nation's voters. This biography comments that "Men of intelligence and power had been impressed with Lincoln's clear, incisive thinking. . . . Since the Senate race against Douglas, a great many people had begun to think of Lincoln as a possible contender for the Presidency" (Miers 74).

Third, the Great Debates allowed the entire nation to become acquainted with Abraham Lincoln. Barely known outside of the state of Illinois, Lincoln was catapulted to national prominence

in six months because of the debates (Angle and Miers 288). As the reporters' news releases gained national coverage, Lincoln's reputation grew. While he lost the senatorial election to Douglas, Lincoln's popularity, due to the publication of the debates in newspapers and later in book form, ultimately led to his presidential election two years later. The book, The Lincoln-Douglas Debates, comments on the impact of the debates on both Lincoln and Douglas' later political careers.

The views that Lincoln expounded led directly to his nomination in 1860 and to the winning of 180 electoral votes in his behalf by the Republican party. The views asserted by Douglas cost him the support of the South and led to fragmentation of the Democratic party. (Dennis 99)

Finally, the Lincoln Douglas debates served as model debates for subsequent political clashes. On September 26, 1960, the first presidential debate was held. The Democratic candidate, John F. Kennedy, and the Republican candidate, Richard M. Nixon, chose, like Lincoln and Douglas, to take their positions on the important issues in the presidential race to the people (Freeley 317). Utilizing television and radio networks, these politicians patterned their debates after the famous 1858 debates. Following suit, presidential hopefuls, Jimmy Carter and Gerald Ford in 1976, Jimmy Carter and Ronald Reagan in 1980, and Walter Mondale and Ronald Reagan in 1984, aired their views on decisive issues (Adkins and Masters 2). All of these debates met the basic

criteria of the Great Debates in that one person confronted one person, a cross-examination period was allowed, and ideas were given for the purpose of convincing an audience. Austin J. Freeley says that the four debates between Kennedy and Nixon "provided the American people with the best means of reasoned decision making thus far available in any Presidential campaign" (319). In the book, The Great Debates Carter vs. Ford 1976, the impact of the Carter-Ford confrontations were explored. One of the long term historical changes noted was that "television emerged in the 1960's as the principle source of news for most Americans, and correlatively the principle medium of campaigning for presidential candidates" (Sears and Chaffee 223). The importance of these debates to each of the candidates was assessed when Sears and Chaffee pointed to the reason each of the candidates participated in the verbal endeavors: "The Ford-Carter debates took place mainly because each candidate thought he had a better chance of winning the election if he debated" (224).

The historic debates of 1858, then, provided an effective means of communicating with the voters; however, these debates also served as an example for a new forensic event: Lincoln-Douglas debate. After considering the principles used by Abraham Lincoln and Stephen Douglas in 1858, the National Forensic League (NFL), an organization which supports the high school forensic community, decided in 1979 to establish a competitive event modeled after these historic debates. The rationale for creating this event for high school competition occurred following the

final two-person debate at the national meet held on the Princeton High School campus. Criticisms from school officials and the private sector caused the NFL Executive Council to consider the future of communication and debate in the NFL. Charges that the debaters were too fast and incomprehensible were made. Added to this fact was the withdrawal of support by superintendents and principals from debate programs at their schools (Winfield 4). Dennis Winfield, the Executive Secretary for NFL and one of the originators of L-D, reported the events leading up to the creation of L-D.

Conversations with members of the NFL Executive Council confirmed that the members knew of the problem, but didn't know what could be done to bring about a remedy. Mr. James Copeland, a member of the Executive Council, was the first person to suggest that perhaps we needed another event similar to two-person debate, but which would require a proposition of value that would demand persuasion, analysis, and comparison from the debater. The members of the Executive Council agreed. Mr. Frank Sferra and Mr. Copeland suggested the title of 'Lincoln-Douglas Debate,' which was unanimously accepted by all nine of the NFL Council members meeting November 9, 1979. (Winfield 6)

The Executive Committee chose the name, Lincoln-Douglas debate, because they planned to design the format after the Great

Debates. George Grice and Edwin Knaak succinctly explain that the name was carefully selected.

It is not just happenstance that the type of debate in which you participate is called Lincoln-Douglas debate. It could have been named individual or value debate to denote how it differs from traditional team debate. Nevertheless, the forensic community chose to preserve the names of the Illinois politicians who engaged in seven historic debates in 1858. (1)

The NFL leadership published the announcement concerning the new form of debate, detailing the rules and judging criteria to be followed. In an effort to encourage participation, the NFL National Tournament, held in Huntsville, Alabama in 1980, offered L-D for the first time (Shofner interview).

The link to the kind of debate the NFL Executive Committee was seeking and the type of debating Lincoln and Douglas did in 1858 is elucidated by Timothy Miller and Tim Sommers.

Lincoln and Douglas were both great men with great minds, but the crucial factor in their debates was communication. Pure reason does not win men's hearts, understanding does. . . . This is the ideal, and indeed the strength of Lincoln-Douglas Debate. An L-D debater analyzes and communicates. . . . His only defenses are his understanding, his intelligence, and his wit. (10)

The concept of Lincoln-Douglas debate is to encourage the debaters to communicate ideas, placing a strong emphasis on oral persuasion, and like the Great Debates, only two debaters are involved in the argumentation.

The state of Texas began offering L-D debate as a competitive event in 1980. Following the guidelines set by NFL, the Texas Forensic Association (TFA), an organization of Texas speech and debate teachers, sanctioned this contest event. According to Ann Shofner, Amarillo High School debate coach, entry to the state tournament was not by qualification during the first year. A coach from each previously qualifying school could enter one student in L-D. Approximately thirty students entered the contest at state in 1980 (interview). Charlotte English, coach of Plano East Senior High School, added that the sentiment of many of the forensic coaches in Texas was that L-D was not going to last as a competitive event and had little chance of becoming a popular forensic activity (interview).

However, during the six years of offering L-D as a competitive event in Texas tournaments, a notable development both in the acceptance and in increased participation in L-D has taken place (King interview). For the past two years Kandi King, Individual Qualifying Tournament Coordinator for TFA, kept records on the number of entries in the local TFA tournaments for L-D and team debate. Her records show the following:

<u>1984-1985</u>		<u>1985-1986</u>	
40	tournaments	49	tournaments
1,573	two-person debate teams	1,498	two-person debate teams
2,132	L-D entrants	2,112	L-D entrants
<u>Percentage of Entries</u>		<u>Percentage of Entries</u>	
42.5%	two-person teams	41.5%	two-person teams
57.5%	L-D teams	58.5%	L-D teams

In 1985-86, three TFA tournaments offered L-D as their only debate event, while one tournament offered only two-person debate. Three tournaments did not offer any form of debate. Due to a bookkeeping problem, the records for only two years of debate participation exist. A pattern cannot be drawn from these two years; however, the information serves to document recent participation in L-D and two-person debate. Records show 66 students competed in L-D in the 1986 Texas State Speech Tournament as compared to thirty participants in 1980 (King interview).

Several phenomena can be observed from this information. First, the number of tournaments held under the auspices of TFA is increasing. This fact tends to point to the idea of increased participation by Texas forensic squads. Second, while the tournaments show more entries in L-D than in two-person debate

for 1984-1986, the number of participants in two-person debate is actually greater. In 1984-1985, 3,146 students were involved in two-person debate, while 2,132 students were entered in L-D. The tournaments held in 1985-86 show 2,896 students competing in two-person debate, while 2,112 participated in L-D. Finally, the number of two-person debate teams is still substantial in tournament competition in Texas. In 1985-1986, 2,996 students entered team competition in TFA Qualifying Tournaments, and this number denotes a considerable amount of interest.

Since only two years of records exist, these numbers set no significant trend; however, the forensic picture of what is occurring in Texas debate in 1986 is more clearly viewed through these records. The number of entries of both team debate and L-D demonstrate an involvement in both types of debate, indicating a competitive interest in both activities on the part of Texas forensic students.

In 1985, the Texas University Interscholastic League (UIL) began offering L-D as a contest event. The introduction of L-D into the UIL occurred for two reasons. First, the member schools in the UIL demonstrated an interest for L-D in three surveys which had been distributed to the forensic teachers at the schools. The UIL leadership became aware of this interest and set out to institute the event into the District competitions. Second, the directors of UIL felt that the area of debate needed a new event. Janet Wiman, Academic Activities Director of UIL, explained, "Debate was the first UIL event ever offered and

nothing had ever been done to augment this competitive area" (Wiman interview). Like TFA participation the past two years, the percent of L-D entrants is increasing within the UIL. In 1986, the UIL state office asked the District Chairs to document the number of participants in L-D and team debate. Out of 1200 districts, 1144 responded. The figures for the number of students in each conference entered in team debate follow:

<u>1985</u>	<u>1986</u>
A..... 102	A..... 98
AA..... 109	AA..... 137
AAA..... 153	AAA..... 199
AAAA..... 113	AAAA..... 125
AAAAA..... 294	AAAAA..... 332
Total..... <u>771</u>	Total..... <u>891</u>

The figures for L-D for the past two years follow:

<u>1985</u>	<u>1986</u>
A..... 69	A..... 78
AA..... 87	AA..... 110
AAA..... 163	AAA..... 197
AAAA..... 83	AAAA..... 120
AAAAA..... 362	AAAAA..... 392
Total..... <u>764</u>	Total..... <u>897</u>

In the UIL competitions, both team debate and L-D are growing in numbers. From 1985 to 1986, team debate increased by 120 teams, while L-D augmented its participation by 133 entrants. This information shows the continued involvement by schools in both L-D and team debate, as well as demonstrates the expansion of the schools' forensic support of these competitions. The actual number of students participating in team debate is greater than the number participating in L-D for both years. In 1985, 1,542 students were entered in team debate, while L-D had 764 entrants. Likewise, 1986 shows 1,782 students participating in team debate and 897 entrants in L-D debate. These records reflect the only two years L-D has been offered as a UIL event.

A trend of growth cannot necessarily be assessed from these two years of UIL-sponsored L-D debate; however, the two years do show an increase in participation of 13.5% in team debate and an increase of 17.4% in L-D debate from 1985 to 1986. For sure, this information indicates forensic growth in Texas high schools, and students are electing to enter both team and L-D debate.

As a competitive debate event, L-D has some distinct characteristics. One unique feature of L-D is the selection of debate topics. While team debaters in the high schools of Texas have the same topic for an entire year, Lincoln-Douglas debaters do not. Texas Forensic Association Qualifying Tournaments pick their resolutions from an approved list chosen by the state committee (Grice and Knaak 3). Non-qualifying tournaments, competitions held without the sanction of TFA, select whatever topic

they wish. On the other hand, UIL publishes two topics each year. In September, The Leaguer, UIL's academic newspaper, announces a topic to be used for practice rounds throughout the fall. In January, the topic is released for the District, Regional, and State meets (Wiman interview). The topic selection for L-D is important for several reasons. Initially, the topics change at least five times per year. The naming of different topics and preparation of L-D debate cases are directly linked. Unlike the team debater who researches one topic the entire year, the L-D debater must write new cases and research various subjects throughout the forensic season. This topic change causes the difference in the amount of evidence a team or L-D debater acquires. Since the team debater has one case the entire year, he/she will accumulate much more evidence than the L-D debater who must change topics frequently.

Second, the writing of a number of cases is a distinguishing feature of L-D. While the team debater may change his affirmative approach during the year, the topic never changes. The L-D debater, on the other hand, must examine a number of varying subjects and prepare numerous cases for those subjects.

In addition, Lincoln-Douglas debate is still in the formative stages; however, several factors have had a major impact on the development of L-D in Texas. In the first place, in 1984 the Texas Legislature enacted into law House Bill 72. One of the provisions of the bill was to limit the absences a public school student could have while participating in extracurricular

activities. Due to this law, many Texas tournaments are held on Saturday only. The Saturday contest, however, posed its own obstacle: time. In order to solve this problem, a number of schools chose to offer only L-D debate because it takes less time to run (King interview). Second, L-D has grown in some areas of Texas because tournaments are offering novice L-D as well as championship L-D events. By having both of these divisions, "Texas L-D competitions serve to enhance the abilities of the competitors, as they are given the opportunity to clash with students of comparable skills" (Day interview). In addition, debaters who are just beginning to become involved in argumentation activities feel less intimidated if they can begin with persons of similar experience (Friedman interview).

A third factor affecting L-D development is that L-D requires less research expenses and no financial investment in a debate camp. The debate coach at South Grand Prairie High School, Mark Evans, believes that team debaters must attend a debate workshop to acquire a start in researching the year's topic. On the other hand, L-D debaters do not have a great emphasis placed upon a copious accumulation of evidence. They can achieve their preparation goals for the year without investing in a debate camp (interview). Other coaches agreeing with this idea include: Ann Shofner, Amarillo High School; Mechelle Sexton, Duncanville High School; and Janet Wiman, UIL Coordinator (interviews). While the L-D debater may choose to participate in debate camp, the necessity of involvement is not as demanding as

team debate attendance. This financial aspect of L-D makes it particularly appealing to the small school districts (Shofner interview).

For a forensic event which is only six years old, L-D is enjoying widespread acceptance. Offered as both a Texas Forensic Association qualifying event and a competition for the University Interscholastic League, L-D debate presents a form of debate which is both challenging and rewarding. Based on her association with other coaches and the enthusiasm of her own debaters, Ann Shofner, President of TFA, sees "a very bright future for Lincoln-Douglas debate in Texas" (interview). As Texas forensic students participate in L-D debate, the merit of this activity emerges, for the resolving of controversies through persuasive communication is important to society. From the question of electing rulers of a country to the supporting of personal beliefs, individuals attempt to solve their differences through this type of decision-making process. Randall Capps and J. Regis O'Connor in their book, Fundamentals of Effective Speech Communication, indicate that persuasive speaking is the best method of "providing a decision which is the most wise, feasible, and pragmatic . . ." (150). In order for the persuasive speaker to influence listeners' opinions and actions, however, all of the communication skills are necessary and important. Monroe and Ehninger consider these principles to encompass the determining of the purpose of the speech, gathering supporting material, organizing ideas, and analyzing the audience. They explain that an

effective persuasive speech must contain all of these elements (12-14).

Like the persuasive speaker, the debater must also adhere to certain principles. In fact, persuasion is essential to the practice of debate. Ray E. Weisenborn states that "Formal debate is persuasion at its apex of perfection . . ." (Terry 30). Other experts agree. Austin J. Freeley defines persuasion as ". . . communication intended to influence the acts, beliefs, attitudes, and values of others" (7). He further explains, "Clearly, one method of persuasion is debate" (7). In the article, "A Behavioral Approach to Debate: Evidence and Credibility," Philip Emmert states, "Persuasion theory underlies debate" (87). Finally, Ronald F. Reid in his book, Introduction to the Field of Speech, defines debate as ". . . a more elaborate form of persuasive public speaking; consequently, the elements of clear and persuasive discourse are essential to effective debating" (100).

For both the persuasive speaker and debater one principle ultimately becomes paramount in their preparation and delivery: audience analysis. The key element in oral persuasion is the audience. Just as the speech to persuade is made to promote beliefs or incite action, the debater offers arguments and motives for audience evaluation. This seeking of concurrence on the part of the audience is what Chaim Perelman in The New Rhetoric finds is the objective of argumentation. This adherence to claims made by the debater is the debater's task (1).

The audience centered theory of argumentation should cause the debater to be aware of the role of communicator. The

selection and organization of arguments are crucial; as Patterson and Zarefsky relate, the ". . . goal [of the debater] is the adaptation of ideas to people so as to influence their behavior" (282). A number of factors must be considered when analyzing one's audience. Monroe and Ehninger note that a knowledge of the audience's probable interests and attitudes can be anticipated by considering the listeners' age, sex, occupation, and education. In addition, the audience's knowledge of the subject, its attitude toward the subject, its acceptance of the debater personally, and the feelings of the audience toward the side upheld by the debater must be assessed (44-51). All of these factors can be examined when the debater follows a basic principle of argumentation: that the selecting of argumentation, organization, evidence and reasoning is based on the audience.

Of importance to the analysis of the audience is the topic debated. The topic often determines the process the debater must go through in order to adequately access the audience. In the book, Basic Debate, Fryar and Thomas discuss the significance of the statement of the topic. They explain that each type of resolution calls ". . . for its own unique levels of support, explanation, development, and proof" (8). Generally, these propositions are classified into three categories: propositions of fact, propositions of policy, and propositions of value. The way the topic is worded sets up its ". . . request for the listener's belief . . ." (Patterson and Zarefsky 20) and for the type of debating required. "In short, the resolution is the top of an

argumentative pyramid" (20).

The relationship between the resolution and its argumentation is apparent in every type of debate. Propositions of fact must be objective statements which depend upon ". . . the quality of factual data and the quality of reasoning used in drawing relationships between known facts" (Fryar and Thomas 11). Competitive forensics in Texas does not offer a specific type of debate employing this type of resolution. However, propositions of fact are used in the courtroom. Sample topics in academic debate are "Resolved that radiation from nuclear power plants is hazardous to human health," and "Resolved that aerosol cans pose a threat to the atmosphere" (Young 5). The construction of the debate case for a proposition of fact is unique. The argument and audience analysis is designed to persuade the listeners on a factual issue.

While similar in some respects to the proposition of fact model, two-person debate employs policy resolutions, topics which call for a course of action. "They propose a rule, regulation, or law to govern decisions within a designated problem area" (Fryar and Thomas 20). Agencies of jurisdiction such as the federal government and specific direction of the action such as 'should control' and 'comprehensive procedures' are included within the statement of the policy proposal. The 1986-87 high school debate topic, "Resolved that the federal government should implement a comprehensive long-term agricultural policy in the United States," implies that the debaters must choose a plan

which either increases or decreases government involvement in the regulation of agriculture. The statement of the resolution determines the grounds to be discussed and also defines for the debater the type of argumentation involved.

Finally, some topics concern questions of value. Value debating and L-D are directly linked because by the very statement of the resolution, the L-D debater recognizes the type of debating required. In 1985, Texas L-D debaters debated the topic, "Resolved that a just social order ought to place the principle of equality above that of Liberty." A judgment as to the desirability or undesirability of the concept was involved along with the value of other democratic ideals. Moreover, in The Value Debate Handbook, the difference between policy and value topics is clarified:

Value debate is unique from policy debate because value propositions are unique from policy propositions. The subject matter of value debate differs from that of policy debate because the statement of the topic imposes unique limits and burdens on policy and value debaters. (Polk, English, and Walker 3)

Value debate is concerned with whether something is good or desirable. Instead of offering solutions, the debater considers ethical questions and consequently supports certain values. The human values under which the L-D propositions fall are moral, concerned with right and wrong; artistic or aesthetic

considerations; political assessments, such as the value of enhancing liberty; and utilitarian beliefs, an objective to achieve (Fryar and Thomas 9-10). In preparing a debate case, the L-D debater must also be familiar with Abraham Maslow's hierarchy of needs. When one value confronts another, the determining value is the one that is higher on the hierarchy. "The levels are: 1) survival, 2) security, 3) love, 4) esteem, 5) self-actualization" (Miller and Sommers 6). The evaluative aspect of L-D comes then in the judgment of the intrinsic worth of ideas or principles. No definite answers emerge. Such deliberation is what makes L-D a focus of conflicting values.

Thus, each type of debate demands a different approach to the given topic by the debater. Every approach, however, teaches the debater certain valuable skills. For example, propositions of fact enable one to interpret data objectively, while propositions of policy force the debater to formulate viable solutions to real-world problems. Both types of debate differ markedly, yet each one offers its own unique advantages. Likewise, value propositions, employed by Lincoln-Douglas debaters, develop certain important forensic skills.

The first merit of L-D is found in its enhancement on the student's independence and self-reliance. The format of L-D dictates that one person opposes another person in the verbal confrontation. This very distinction is what Grice and Knaak find to be favorable about L-D as they observe:

The most obvious difference . . . is the format.

In L-D debate you do not have a partner. You are neither 'burdened' with a colleague nor can you rely on him to 'pull you through' the debate. (1)

The fact that L-D involves only one person per side has several implications. High school students, considering becoming involved in debate, often select L-D because they enjoy the opportunity to work alone (English interview). The writing of the case, researching of ideas, and presenting of arguments is therefore the responsibility of the individual student. Miller and Sommers agree that this quality of L-D is appealing to many students. They comment, "An L-D debater stands alone; he creates his own case, presents it, and defends it alone" (10).

In addition, some debaters find themselves often committed to more than one school activity. L-D provides the opportunity to plan one's own schedule without depending on another debater. The President of TFA for 1986, Ann Shofner, feels that this aspect of L-D is important to her debate squad. She comments that "many of my students are involved in a number of extracurricular programs. L-D affords these students the 'debate experience,' while still being able to be active in their school affairs" (Shofner interview).

Finally, another reward of debating alone is the gratification a student can receive from self-accomplishment. Having researched the material and developed the arguments alone, the L-D debater can feel confident by 'being in control.' Mary Young

addresses this advantage when she comments, "Many debaters find attractive the prospect of not having to rely on a colleague to deliver the best arguments" (9). Of course, the debater may also enjoy not having to endure the agony of his/her colleague dropping the best arguments, which can be the case in team debate. The knowledge of self-accomplishment in turn rewards the L-D debater with self-esteem. As Robert Kemp stresses, the L-D debater, because of debating alone, has the realization that "I can create something on my own" (45). This self-esteem is a basic human need met through the activity of L-D.

Another aspect of value debating which is unique in its merits is involved in the actual debating of values. In the article, "Toward a Logic of Good Reasons," Walter Fisher extolls the merits of studying values. He feels "that the most indispensable need in contemporary rhetoric is a scheme by which values can be identified and their implications critically considered" (376). He explains that human beings are basically "as much valuing as they are reasoning animals" (376), and that since value judgments are inevitable, they must be studied by the speaker. L-D debate gives this opportunity to the student. A thorough understanding of the value structure is necessary for a successful L-D student, for he/she must defy the value defended in each debate round, establish the value's importance, and weigh the value he/she is supporting in contrast to the value upheld by the opposing side. This activity enhances the understanding of values by the L-D debate student. Furthermore, the debating of

values enables the L-D participant to intelligently determine his own values. The article, "Arguing Value Propositions," observes that our society is beset by controversies involving values. As the L-D debater develops a skill in the understanding of the hierarchy of values and their adaptation to the debate topic, an advantage of L-D becomes apparent, for ". . . value resolutions provide students with an opportunity to clarify their own values and to make the ethical choices necessary to life in contemporary society" (109-119). Janet Wiman, Activities Director for UIL, feels that "Debating values is great training for citizenship. A student needs to be able to identify his/her own values, and I think that L-D encourages the student to do just that" (interview). The in-depth investigation an L-D debater must make into value judgments can contribute greatly to his development as a well-rounded individual.

The final distinguishing feature of value debating is the emphasis placed upon oral persuasion to the common individual. In competition, L-D debaters often attempt to convince lay citizens to agree with them. Fryar and Thomas comment on the importance of good communication skills in L-D. "This event is founded on the principle that debate can be an oral communication event in which students learn how to speak . . ." (1). Standards of forceful delivery, clarity, and wit enable the L-D debater to persuade the common person, not an expert, about a position. Like Lincoln and Douglas in their debates, the L-D debater is addressing the average listener. In an interview on

July 3, 1986, Larry McCarty, debate coach from Kerrville, remarks that "anyone" should be able to judge an L-D round (interview), while Patti Day, coach from Arlington, agrees. She feels the L-D judge can be inexperienced without the knowledge of debate (interview). Therefore, the L-D debater develops a case and presentation for these common individuals, and, consequently, the merit of this aspect of L-D becomes clearer. Grice and Knaak elaborate on this point by commenting, "Lincoln-Douglas debate, in short, is 'real-world' oriented and is an excellent training ground for those who want to test their skills of argumentation, audience analysis, and persuasion" (4). As the L-D debater attempts to gain the acceptance and belief of his judge, audience analysis becomes of paramount importance. The ultimate goal of the L-D debater is to sway the audience (judge) to support a value. Realizing that the evaluator is usually not experienced in debate, the L-D debater strives to discover the successful approach to the judge. Grice and Knaak further underscore the importance of analyzing the critic. "He [the judge] is your audience! As such, he is an essential element in shaping and evaluating your success as an advocate" (4).

As Texas high school students leave the classroom, they must be prepared to voice their ideas, supporting them with logic and evidence. L-D's accent on persuasion with the common person offers the debater the chance to enhance his reasoning abilities along with his skills in communication. Miller and Sommers explain this idea.

Complete understanding comes from being able to communicate our understanding to others, and debate as a tool of democracy and free thought must result from a marriage of information processing and communication. This is the ideal, and indeed the strength of Lincoln-Douglas debate.

(10)

As the L-D debater attempts to persuade the judge/audience, he/she must be keenly aware of the ways to best convince the listener. William H. Bennett points out that in order to communicate within the debate, the debater must be concerned with how a person responds to the debater and his/her discourse (281-288). Aristotle in his writing, Rhetorica, elaborates upon the modes of persuasion and the ways used to induce belief.

Of the modes of persuasion furnished by the spoken word there are three kinds. The first kind depends on the personal character of the speaker; the second on putting the audience into a certain frame of mind; the third on the proof, or apparent proof, provided by the words of the speech itself.

(24, 25)

The responsibility of the L-D debater is to understand these modes and how they can best be employed.

The personal character of the speaker is commonly referred to as ethical proof or ethos. Lester W. Thonssen, in his study of Aristotle, comments on the importance of this persuasion mode.

He feels that "a serviceable end is achieved" through the speaker's good moral character and good will (304-306). Furthermore, Aristotle observes the significance of this form of proof when he comments about the speaker, "his character may almost be called the most effective means of persuasion he possesses" (25). Ronald Reid concurs with the importance ethos plays in debate and public speaking. In his discussion of the variables in speaking, Reid defines the power of the speaker's personal character upon the audience. After much inquiry, he concludes that "numerous research studies show that the persuasive effect of the listener's attitude toward the speaker is quite significant" (66, 67). Franklyn S. Haiman in the article, "An Experimental Study of the Effects in Public Speaking," cites an example demonstrating this concept.

. . . a recorded speech on national health insurance (was presented) to three similar audiences. Each audience heard exactly the same speech, but each was told that it was by a different speaker. In one case, the speech was attributed to the Surgeon General; in another, to the Secretary-General of the Communist party; in another, to an unidentified university sophomore. The speech by the 'Surgeon General' was significantly more effective in shifting attitudes on health insurance than either of the other two 'speakers'. (190-202)

More recently, the question of the importance of ethical proof was considered in the 1980 Presidential Debates. Goodwin F. Berquist and James L. Golden studied the two televised debates and analyzed the voter reaction to the debaters. Their conclusion was that in contrasting arguments and reasoning with delivery and appearance that Anderson and Carter had more substance and evidence than did Reagan. They concluded, however, that "while Reagan apparently lost points due to his lack of hard core content, he more than offset this deficiency through his presentational skills and physical appearance". . . . This perceived superiority of Reagan in the area of delivery, appearance, and manner made the difference in the reception of the audience to Ronald Reagan and his ideas (132, 133). Another study agreed. Jane Blankenship, Marlene G. Fine, and Leslie K. Davis considered the impact of Ronald Reagan's ethos upon the outcome of the Republican primary debates. While all but one of the debates were televised by the Public Broadcasting System, reporters and voters watched and listened "as attractive and articulate Republican candidates emerged. . . . Each of the debaters had a degree of public and/or television presence beyond the skill of the average citizen. Yet none could match the physical and metaphysical presence of Reagan" (225-27). Ronald Reagan possessed during the entire campaign what Aristotle referred to as the demeanor of a good man. When the power of persuasion was of vital importance, Reagan used ethical proof. As Aristotle succinctly pointed out, "We believe good men more fully and more

readily than others: this is true generally whatever the question is, and absolutely true where exact certainty is impossible and opinions are divided" (25).

The second form of proof employed by the speaker/debater involves the stirring of the audience's emotions. Aristotle considered this form of proof when he observed, "Our judgments when we are pleased and friendly are not the same as when we are pained and hostile" (25). Lester W. Thonssen's interpretation of this mode of persuasion, pathetic proof, was that listeners are moved when their emotions are touched. In order then for the speaker to attain the desired reaction, he/she must understand emotions from three points of view: "the state of mind of the person feeling the emotion, those toward whom the emotion is felt, and on what grounds the emotion is felt" (306). An L-D debater must consider pity, envy, anger, fear, and kindness when choosing his words and planning his cases. In fact, all of the emotions in relation to human character are important to explore in persuasion. In the textbook, Your Speech, a justification for emotion proofs is made.

There are times when an emotional appeal is necessary. . . . After presenting solid arguments to convince you, a speaker may appeal to your emotions to impress you or to move you to action. . . . After explaining why a new wing to a hospital is needed, why a certain fund-raising campaign is necessary, or why you should buy government bonds,

a speaker can rightfully appeal to your civic pride, charitable instincts, or patriotic sentiments to get you to act. (Griffith, Nelson, Stasheff 102, 103)

Elson and Peck agree with the significance of pathos, emotional proofs, in persuasion. They comment, "Facts and sound reasoning will get a sympathetic reception when they are supported by constructive emotional appeal" (414). The L-D debater, therefore, must include this type of persuasion mode in the support for his/her cases.

The third kind of persuasive mode involves logical proof or logos. Aristotle observed that "persuasion is effected through the speech itself when we have proved a truth or an apparent truth by means of the persuasive arguments suitable to the case in question" (25). The selection of these arguments and their presentation depends upon the audience. Opinions accepted by the judge, reasoning developed for a particular judge, and selection of evidence, believable to a certain judge all compose considerations for the persuasive speaker. As the speaker advances "arguments of specific types . . . (as) instruments by means of which particular responses are secured. . ." (Thonssen, 307), he/she chooses proofs which will effect a change in the judge's thinking.

A number of logical proofs are available for the L-D debater. Monroe and Ehninger assert the three forms they consider most often employed. First, the persuasive speech has

reasoning from example. This form of logical proof involves the drawing of reasonable conclusions, based on the study of specific cases. "Scientific experiments, public opinion polls, and studies of social behavior all depend on reasoning from example" (202). Another type of logical proof is reasoning from axiom. This particular kind of reasoning uses the application of a general principle to a specific example. Generalizations are often presented in the persuasive speech in an effort to substantiate a valid premise (203). Finally, reasoning from cause effect relationships is often used to convince an audience. Monroe and Ehninger relate that this type of logical thinking is employed more than any other by persuasive speakers (203). This type of support explains the reason for a happening or a problem. The outcome brought about by a particular problem is then determined. Discovering the beginning of a problem and its results enables the persuasive speaker the opportunity to learn a great deal about relationships of certain phenomena.

These modes of persuasion are important to the L-D debater. In planning the debate case and the strategy for a topic, the debater must be aware of ethos, pathos, and logos, and how they relate to his/her audience. Aristotle sums up this most vital concept when he says that a person who is to be in command of effecting persuasion must be able to understand "human character and goodness," be able to analyze the emotions of the listeners, thus selecting the best support for emotional responses, and "to reason logically" (25).

L-D debate, conceived in 1980 from the Great Debates, is a unique form of debate. As a totally new contest in Texas forensics, L-D is earning a place in the schools' curriculum. L-D debate's merits include its emphasis on persuasion, the opportunity to work alone, and an understanding of human needs and values. In addition, the skills associated with analyzing the audience are developed. Encompassing a myriad of considerations concerning the listeners, the L-D debater emerges from this activity with greater expertise in argumentation and reasoning.

WORKS CITED CHAPTER II

- Adkins, Carl, and J.E. Masters. Lincoln-Douglas Debate Handbook. Austin: U. I. L. Div. of Continuing Ed., 1985.
- Angle, Paul M., and Earl Schenck Miers, eds. The Living Lincoln The Man, His Mind, His Times, and the War He Fought, Reconstructed From His Own Writings. New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 1955.
- Aristotle, Rhetorica, trans. by W. Rhys Roberts, Oxford: Oxford UP, 1946.
- Bennett, William H. "The Role of Debate in Speech Communication." The Speech Teacher, XXI (Nov. 1972), 281.
- Berquist, Goodwin F., and James L. Golden. "Media Rhetoric, Criticism and the Public Perception of the 1980 Presidential Debates." Quarterly Journal of Speech 67 May 1981, 125-137.
- Blankenship, Jane, Marlene G. Fine, and Leslie K. Davis. "The 1980 Republican Primary Debates: The Transformation of Actor to Scene," Quarterly Journal of Speech, 69 (Feb. 1983), 25-36.
- Capps, Randall, and J. Regis O'Connor. Fundamentals of Effective Speech Communication. Cambridge: Winthrop, 1978.
- Day, Patti. Telephone interview. 1 July 1986.
- Dennis, Frank L. The Lincoln-Douglas Debates. New York: Mason, 1978.

- English, Charlotte. Telephone interview. 6 July 1986.
- Evans, Mark. Telephone interview. 24 July 1986.
- Fisher, Walter R. "Toward a Logic of Good Reasons." The Quarterly Journal of Speech. 64 (1978), 376.
- Freeley, Austin J. Argumentation and Debate. Belmont: Wadsworth, 1981.
- Friedman, Barbara. Telephone interview. 1 July 1986.
- Fryar, Maridell and David A. Thomas. Basic Debate. Skokie: National Textbook, 1982.
- . Student Congress and Lincoln-Douglas Debate. Skokie: National Textbook, 1981.
- Grice, George L., and Edwin W. Knaak, Jr. Lincoln-Douglas for Novices. San Antonio: The Texas Group, 1985.
- Haiman, Franklyn S. "An Experimental Study of the Effects of Ethos in Public Speaking." Speech Monographs. XVI (Nov. 1949), 190-202.
- Kemp, Robert L. Lincoln-Douglas Debating. Clayton: Alan, 1984.
- . Lincoln-Douglas Debating. Clayton: The Study Group, 1983.
- King, Kandi. Telephone interview. 9 July 1986.
- Kraus, Sidney, ed. The Great Debate Carter vs. Ford. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1979.
- McCarty, Larry. Telephone interview. 3 July 1986.
- Miers, Earl Schenck. Abraham Lincoln In Peace and War. New York: American Heritage, 1964.

- Miller, Timothy M., and Tim Sommers. "Lincoln-Douglas Debate Is 'Debate'." The Rostrum 57 Jan. 1983: 10-12.
- . "The Analysis of Value Propositions and Values." The Rostrum 57 Mar. 1983: 4-7.
- Monroe, Alan H., and Douglas Ehninger. Principles of Speech. Chicago: Scott, Foresman, 1962.
- Oates, Stephen B. Abraham Lincoln The Man Behind the Myths. New York: NAL, 1985.
- Patterson, J. W., and David Zarefsky. Contemporary Debate. Boston: Houghton, 1983.
- Perelman, Chaim, and L. Olbrechts-Tyteca. The New Rhetoric. Notre Dame: U. of Notre Dame Press, 1971.
- Polk, Lee R., William B. English, and Erik Walker. The Value Debate Handbook. Waco: Baylor Briefs, 1985.
- Reid, Ronald F., ed. Introduction to the Field of Speech. Chicago: Scott, Foresman, 1965.
- Shofner, Ann. Telephone interview. 8 July 1986.
- Terry, Donald R., et al., eds. Modern Debate Case Techniques. Skokie: National Textbook, 1981.
- Thomas, Benjamin P. Abraham Lincoln. New York: Knopf, 1962.
- Thomas, David A., ed. Advanced Debate Readings in Theory, Practice, and Teaching. Skokie: National Textbook, 1975.
- . Lincoln-Douglas Debate. Kansas City: National Fed. of State H. S. Assocs., 1981.

- Thonssen, Lester W. "A Functional Interpretation of Aristotle's Rhetoric," Quarterly Journal of Speech, 16 (June 1930), 304.
- Warnick, Barbara. "Arguing Value Propositions." Journal of the American Forensic Association 18 Fall 1981: 109-119.
- Wiman, Janet. Telephone interview. 7 July 1986.
- Winfield, Dennis. "A Step Toward Sanity." The Rostrum 54 Jan. 1980: 7-8.
- . "From the Executive Secretary." The Rostrum 54 Dec. 1979: 2-3.
- Young, Marilyn J. Coaching Debate. Clayton: Alan, 1979.
- Zarefsky, David. "The Lincoln-Douglas Debates Revisited: The Evolution of Public Argument." Quarterly Journal of Speech 72 May 1986: 162-184.

Chapter III

SURVEY RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

As Lincoln-Douglas debate continues to develop as a forensic event at Texas speech tournaments, the attitude of the coaches toward this event and its growth will play a key role in determining L-D's success. The purpose of this chapter is to record the results of the survey and to determine the implications of the responses to the future of L-D in Texas forensic programs.

In order to ascertain the extent of participation and interest in L-D of Texas forensic squads, a questionnaire was sent to every high school coach who belongs to TFA. One hundred seventy-seven questionnaires were mailed in January 1986. In addition, the questionnaire was distributed to every coach attending two Texas tournaments: R. L. Turner High School in Carrollton and Plano Senior High School in Plano. These two tournaments were selected because of their widespread attendance. One hundred coaches participated in these two tournaments. A check list was generated to insure no coach filled out more than one survey.

The results are classified in two sections--the number of respondents and the number in percentages. The survey is reported in the order of the sixty-five responses; however, the first and second questions (name of coach and school affiliation) will not be recorded. Questions three and four also dealt with

general statements by the coaches concerning whether they taught in a public or private school and the number of years the instructors had taught in high school and middle school. Of the sixty-five respondents, only three coaches were employed in private schools. The average number of years coaching in high school was 8.71, while in the middle school the coaches averaged 3.93 years of participation. This personal data served to further identify the Texas coaches in regard to where they taught and their number of years experience.

Table I demonstrates the sizes of the forensic programs of

TABLE I
SIZES OF FORENSIC PROGRAMS

Question	Respondents	Percentage
5. Currently my squad is:		
Between 1 and 10 students	10	15.4%
Between 11 and 25 students	30	46.2
Between 26 and 50 students	22	33.8
Above 50 students	3	4.6
	65	100.0%

the sixty-five respondents and the percentage in each size category. Worth noting is that 80% of the respondents fit into two categories ranging from eleven to fifty students in the forensic program.

The following table indicates the average number of tournaments attended each year by the respondents, size of budgets of the surveyed schools, and membership in TFA. Table II indicates

TABLE II
TOURNAMENT ATTENDANCE, BUDGET AND
TFA MEMBERSHIP INFORMATION

Question	Respondents		Percentage	
6. My team attends approximately <u>10.9</u> (average) tournaments per year.				
7. Our speech budget is:				
Below \$1000.00	15		23.1	
Between \$1000.00 and \$2000.00	7		10.8	
Between \$2000.00 and \$4000.00	25		38.4	
Over \$4000.00	18		27.7	
8. Is your school a member of TFA?	(YES) 59	(NO) 6	(YES) 90.7%	(NO) 9.3%

how the local schools support the forensic programs as is indicated by the number of tournaments the squads attend, the size of each budget, and the number of coaches who are members of TFA.

Table III shows the results of the survey concerning the relationship of the size of squads and the number of tournaments which are attended yearly. Noteworthy is the fact that the larger squads enter more tournaments. This participation is

justified by the fact that there are more students to involve, and therefore more tournaments have to be entered. Even though

TABLE III
NUMBER OF TOURNAMENTS ATTENDED COMPARED TO SIZE OF SQUADS

Size of Squad	Average Number of Tournaments Attended
1-10	8.85
11-25	10.41
26-50	12.91
Over 50	13.66

more tournaments are attended with the larger squads, the number of tournaments per person is reduced. For instance, if a squad of ten attended nine tournaments per year that would be .9 tournaments per person; while a squad of fifty attending fourteen tournaments per year would have an average of .28 tournaments per person. Therefore, the smaller squads possibly provide greater experience for the individual student. On the other hand, the larger the squad, the more opportunities each student has to attend tournaments. This one fact is what is most important; the students have greater opportunities to participate in forensic activities.

Table IV indicates the number of squads and the percentage of those squads who enter both Lincoln-Douglas debate and team debate. Further, the table shows how many squads enter each

event, the number of squads in which L-D debate has increased, and how many years the coach participated in forensics while in high school and college. Interestingly, neither event dominates

TABLE IV

TEAM DEBATE AND L-D DEBATE ATTENDANCE, COACH COMPETITION EXPERIENCE, AND INTEREST INCREASE IN L-D

Question	Respondents		Percentage	
	(YES)	(NO)	(YES)	(NO)
9. Does your squad enter team debate?	50	15	76.9	3.1
10. Does your squad enter Lincoln-Douglas debate?	58	7	89.2	10.8
11. Number of years you competed in high school and college forensics?	Average 3.66			
	Respondents		Percentage	
	(YES)	(NO)	(YES)	(NO)
12. Number of squads which entered both events	49	16	75.0	25.0
13. Has interest in Lincoln-Douglas debate increased in your program?	55	10	84.6	15.4

the other in participation even though 12.3% more squads enter L-D as compared with team debate. However, the figures show that L-D debate interest is on the rise in nearly 85% of the programs surveyed. Increased interest in team debate is not indicated since that question was not included in the survey.

Since interest in L-D debate is rapidly increasing within

TABLE V
INTEREST FACTORS FOR L-D DEBATE

Question	Average of respondents	Rank
13. Rank in order of importance (Number 1 is the most important)		
1. Cost of attending-- entry fees	9.172	10
2. Cost of providing materials (duplicating)	8.086	8
3. Decreased speed of delivery	5.793	7
4. Ease with which young students understand the activity	3.155	1
5. Value derived from studying more than one topic per year	4.362	5
6. Interest of your stu- dents in the activity	4.224	4
7. Gain for student who has other activities and does not want a partner depending on him/her	3.689	2
8. Minimizes coaching time	8.103	9
9. Merit of emphasis on persuasive speaking	3.741	3
10. Enhancement of other forensic activities	5.586	6

the squads investigated, an examination of the reasons is most important. Table V shows ten reasons why interest in L-D debate could be on the increase with the average of the results in the second column and the rank of each possible reason shown in the third column. A breakdown of interest factors with respect to coaching experience is found in Appendix A.

An interpretation of the results of this survey provides understanding for a number of areas in the study of L-D in Texas. The observations and conclusions made from this research are divided into three areas: forensic program information, debate squad data, and interest factors for L-D involvement.

Forensic Program Information

The forensic program information surveyed the size of the squad, tournament attendance, the forensic program budget, and TFA membership. The majority of the coaches surveyed (46.2%) have between eleven and twenty-five students participating in forensics. In fact, few squads have less than eleven students involved (15.4%), while only 4.6% report a squad size of more than fifty students. Most of these programs (38.4%) operate on an annual budget of between \$2,000 to \$4,000. However, nearly one fourth of the schools surveyed (23.1%) are forced to operate on a budget of less than \$1,000. A little more than one fourth of the respondents (27.7%) report an operating budget of over \$4,000 per year. A conclusion reached from this data is that the majority of Texas forensic squads are composed of eleven to twenty-five students. This information is helpful in

formulating a clearer picture of the average Texas forensic squad. In addition, the preponderance of those surveyed indicated that their budgets are between \$2,000 and \$4,000 per year. This data confirms the strong support that forensics is receiving within the local school districts in Texas. When comparing the size of a squad with the average number of tournaments attended, interesting data emerges. Table III data indicates that as the size of the debate squad increases, so does the number of tournaments attended. While a squad of 1-10 students participate in an average of 8.85 tournaments per year, teams of more than fifty students attend 13.6 tournaments annually. Overall, the average number of tournaments entered is 10.9 per year. The conclusion derived from this information is that the coaches who have the largest squads enter more tournaments. These statistics reveal that in Texas, larger forensic squads are the most active squads in tournament competition.

Debate Squad Data

Most of the debate teams (75%) in the survey enter both team and L-D debate. While fifty squads (76.9%) participate in team debate, fifty-eight schools (89.2%) compete in L-D. This data suggests the widespread acceptance of both types of debate. Instead of L-D replacing team debate, the information indicates a mutual participation of both forms of debate. Conclusively, competition in debate involves both team and L-D debate.

Further demonstrating the status of L-D debate in Texas are the figures from the survey noting interest. Widespread

acceptance of L-D is supported by a majority of the schools surveyed noting an increase in interest in L-D within their forensic programs (84.6%). The conclusion reached from this data is that L-D debate is well accepted within Texas schools and is going to increase in acceptance. More tournaments are offering L-D, and additional students entering L-D will most likely be seen as coaches attempt to meet the forensic needs of their students.

Interest Factors

To further explain L-D's increased participation, the coaches were asked to evaluate certain aspects of L-D and to rank them in order of importance. The first of the leading factors influencing coaches to choose L-D debate was the ease with which young students understand the activity. The survey concludes that L-D debate is not as complicated as team debate for the coaches find that new students can more easily comprehend L-D debate. The implications of L-D offering this educational advantage means that L-D is the type of debate many coaches are first introducing to their students. Moreover, this factor denotes a strong help to the forensic instructor, the chance to quickly interest the new debater. In the Texas curriculum, debate is offered as an elective; and thus, coaches must make debate engaging as well as challenging. L-D is a new form of debate giving the coach such an element in his/her teaching.

The second factor influencing coaches' participation in L-D is that students who have other activities find it is the best competition for them. Team debate requires two persons, while

the L-D debater participates alone. The Texas curriculum presents an abundance of opportunities for extracurricular participation. As the forensic teacher plans his/her program, meeting the needs of each of the students is an important consideration. L-D, according to those coaches surveyed, meets the demands of the busy student, as the student seeks to find a forensic activity which will allow him/her the chance to be involved in other programs as well. In addition, L-D gives the independent student the challenge he/she desires, as well as giving him/her the opportunity to work alone.

The Texas coaches surveyed selected the merit of emphasis on persuasive speaking as the third most important factor for participating in L-D debate. In a telephone interview, Mark Evans, South Grand Prairie High School coach, agreed with the results of the survey. He added, "The popularity of L-D has increased in Texas forensics because of L-D's emphasis on a convincing speaking style. The skills of oratory and extemporaneous speaking combine to make an excellent L-D debater" (Evans interview). The impact of this data is that L-D's persuasive quality promotes a strong positive response to L-D debate.

The results of the survey revealed that the interest of the students in L-D was a reason why many coaches selected to offer L-D in their forensic programs. This factor was ranked fourth in importance. As a debate instructor plans the curriculum and program, an important consideration is whether the pupils can be motivated to engage in the planned instruction. The observation

that L-D interests many forensic students may guide the debate teacher in planning a program. This survey allows the Texas debate teacher to realize that coaches recognize and acknowledge the motivating qualities of L-D debate for the high school student.

Another factor in inducing the forensic student to participate in L-D debate was the value the students derived from studying more than one topic per year. Usually a competitive L-D debater has the chance to analyze, research, and develop an affirmative and negative case encompassing at least five different topics during one year's competition. The changing of topics could be seen as a detriment to student interest, yet the survey indicated otherwise. Debaters are selecting L-D because of this added challenge and are finding this aspect of L-D to be worthwhile. This conclusion is of real significance to the teacher. Most importantly, the debate instructor can fulfill three essential teaching elements within the framework of L-D. Developing research skills, analytical thinking, and effective uses of proof through engaging in the study of a number of topics enables the teacher to provide the type of learning experience debate should offer to a student. The fact that students enjoy L-D debate because they can become well versed in more than one topic, permits the teacher to further meet the educational needs of the student.

Viewed as a less important factor for L-D participation was the enhancement of other forensic activities through involvement

in L-D. Charlotte English, Plano East Senior High School coach, pointed out in a telephone interview that at the Texas Forensic Association's State Tournament in 1986, the event of men's extemporaneous speaking was greatly influenced by L-D debaters. In the final round of men's extemp, five out of the six speakers were L-D debaters (English interview). While it is impossible to determine which event influenced the other, L-D's emphasis on persuasive skills is important to note. The significance of this information is that coaches acknowledged that L-D encompasses oratory and extemporaneous speaking abilities, but this fact is not one of the main reasons for students' interest.

L-D debate was conceived in the United States for the express purpose of counteracting some practices found in team debate. The criticism centered around the idea that team debate had lost its capability to communicate to the average listener. This survey on the other hand, discovered that the students are not placing a high priority on the decreased speed of delivery in L-D. The founders of L-D might have considered this factor the most important; however, Texas coaches suggested that the majority of their students are not becoming involved in this competition because of the delivery variable between L-D and team debate. Ranked as the seventh reason for L-D participation, decreased speed is not a preference with the majority of L-D debaters.

The duplicating of information in L-D was not an essential consideration for most of the coaches when planning their budgets

and programs. Those surveyed perceived this influence as being the eighth most important factor for selecting L-D as a competitive event for the students.

On the other hand, two-person debate requires a significant amount of evidence, and this duplication of materials is a factor when preparing two-person teams for competition. Ann Shofner, Amarillo High School coach, agreed, "The low cost of reproducing evidence as compared with team debate is one factor which makes L-D an appealing competition, especially to the small schools with limited budgets" (interview).

Next to the least important interest factor noted in the survey was in the area involving the minimizing of coaching time. Most of the coaches surveyed agreed that L-D required as much coaching time as team debate. The debate coach at Duncanville High School, Mechelle Sexton, pointed out that "L-D debate is quite demanding for both my students and me. It requires a great deal of our time and efforts. Coaching L-D requires as much from me as a coach as team debate does" (interview). The conclusion of the survey in this area is that coaches and students are not selecting L-D as an escape from training or time spent in the activity.

Ranked 10th in the survey of interest factors was the cost of attending a tournament. The fees are less for L-D debate than those for team debate. The amounts charged for L-D range from \$4.00 to \$6.00 per person, while team debate requires from \$5.00 to \$10.00 per team. Even though the cost per participant is less

in team debate, the cost per event is less in L-D debate. Also involved in the tournament entry fees is the judge fee; however, L-D and team debate costs are similar. Tournaments assess an overall fee of \$30.00 to \$40.00 per judge that has to be provided by the host school. This amount applies to L-D and team debate alike. The significance of this information is that it is important to a coach when planning his/her budget and schedule of activities for the year to know what competitions his/her school can afford to enter. With the knowledge that the cost of entering tournaments is not a vital factor for participation in L-D, the debate coach can plan accordingly. Considering the data from the survey, the entry fees involving L-D is not a pressing consideration.

Discussion

This study is important for several reasons. First, over one-third of the coaches who are members of the Texas Forensic Association responded to the survey. In evaluating the status of L-D in Texas from these teachers, an interesting profile of the coaches can be discerned from the survey. Most of the instructors have over five years of coaching experience, while their personal competitive experience averages less than five years. Regarding L-D debate, these coaches find an increase in interest (84%) within their own squads. Given the experience of these coaches, the participation of their teams at this time in debate, and their reporting of increased interest in L-D, the future of L-D looks encouraging.

Second, the debate coaches are choosing to add L-D to their list of competitive events, rather than have L-D replace team debate. While some of the coaches enter only one form of debate (23% do not enter team debate; 10.8% do not enter L-D), the majority of the respondents of the survey (75%) enter both L-D and team debate. In appraising the future of L-D as an event within the tournaments in Texas, it appears as if L-D is an important competition itself and is offered by the forensic teacher as an enhancement, not a replacement, to the debate program.

Third, the reasons for choosing L-D as a competitive event are important to note. The top three reasons selected by those polled in the survey point to the coaches' personal interest in the students. The understanding of the event, the independence provided by L-D, and the emphasis placed on persuasive speaking focus on developing the student and giving him/her a type of opportunity in competition which the coaches feel will challenge and reward these students. While some critics may have felt that coaches were choosing L-D because of their concern over speed of delivery, the survey shows that factor (ranked 7th) is not a crucial consideration.

Finally, the costs do not appear to be a problem for most of the coaches surveyed, as the entry fees (ranked 10th) and the cost of providing materials (ranked 8th) are among the last factors causing a coach to become involved in L-D. In addition, the instructors' coaching time (ranked 9th) is not a chief factor in the forensic programs surveyed. Coaches place other

considerations far above the time required for coaching this activity.

As L-D debate continues to grow and develop as a competitive event in Texas, the observations made by the study can prove both informative and predictive. Debate coaches can be aware of their fellow coaches' support of L-D and of the increasing interest in L-D in the majority of Texas squads. Furthermore, the reasons for the selection of L-D as an additional event are important for those involved in Texas forensic activities.

WORKS CITED CHAPTER III

English, Charlotte. Telephone interview. 6 July 1986.

Evans, Mark. Telephone interview. 24 July 1986.

Sexton, Mechelle. Telephone interview. 27 July 1986.

Shofner, Ann. Telephone interview. 8 July 1986.

Chapter IV

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The study of Lincoln-Douglas debate in Texas encompasses many areas. The coaches and students who are participating in this activity are electing to broaden their forensic skills through competitive involvement. While coaches are choosing L-D because they are finding that it enhances their forensic programs, the debate student is discovering a new form of debate which offers him/her unique forensic opportunities. The purpose of this chapter is to summarize the findings based on the analysis in Chapter III. In addition, conclusions to this study and their significance to forensics will be considered. Finally, future research involving L-D debate will be proposed.

The forensic program information reveals the size of squads, how often the squads attend competitions, and the forensic program budget. This study concludes that the majority of Texas debate squads involve from eleven to twenty-five students. Furthermore, the majority of forensic programs operate on an annual budget of between \$2,000 to \$4,000. In considering tournament attendance, the study finds that an average number of 10 tournaments are attended by debate squads each year.

The importance of this information is that it provides a valuable picture of the participation and involvement of Texas

forensic squads. The size of the teams reveals the student interest in debate and in turn enables the Texas debate teacher competitions.

In assessing the information compiled concerning debate squad data, the conclusion that both Lincoln-Douglas debate and team debate are widely accepted competitions is made. The survey shows that participation in both forms of debate is high and that neither form is replacing the other. The impact of this information is it shows the role of L-D within forensics in Texas high schools. In fact, Lincoln-Douglas debate enhances the debate programs of schools who are already actively involved in team debate and is offered in conjunction with team debate.

Finally, the Texas coaches indicated their reasons for electing to select L-D debate as an activity. The ease with which young students understand L-D ranks as the major consideration of L-D. Very close to this interest factor is the gain for a student who has other activities and does not want a partner depending upon him/her. The third highest interest factor for choosing L-D debate is the value gleaned from the emphasis placed on persuasive speaking. These interest factors are significant to note, for the justification for L-D's success rests with these areas.

In addition, L-D is still a comparatively new activity and as it is studied, the reasons for selecting L-D will ultimately be the cause for its expansion and growth. This study shows that forensic coaches in Texas feel that their programs encourage a

great number of students to become competitors in a variety of areas because of L-D. The persuasive nature of L-D improves public speaking techniques and enables debaters to achieve better methods of communication; therefore, a forensic program which includes L-D debate enables the coach to broaden his/her focus to include a great variety of speaking skills.

The merits of L-D debate to the forensic student include the persuasive skills developed, the defining of values and the chance to study the worth of values, the diversity of topic research, and the occasion to work independently. The reaction by students is one of acceptance and active participation. In fact, L-D debate is now a well accepted competitive event, indicating an overwhelming student response in Texas.

A number of recommendations for future study are important to consider in order to fully understand L-D debate in Texas. First, a comparison of L-D debate and C.E.D.A. would provide a challenging investigation of the differences between collegiate and high school argumentation. The inquiry of why C.E.D.A. was begun and its progress toward the goals originally set at its inception could prove valuable. Since L-D's growth in the next year should reveal its continued acceptance, an analysis of L-D's advancement, its moving to meet students' needs, and its original goals might be worthwhile. The linking of C.E.D.A. and L-D in these respects could prove helpful.

Second, an analysis of the topic, "Lincoln-Douglas Debate: A Public Speaking or Debate Event?" is suggested through this

study. The emphasis placed on L-D as a persuasive event in addition to the concept that L-D enhances oratorical skills in other individual events makes this subject relevant. The National Forensic League allows competitors to report points for L-D in either the debate area or individual participation column, further stimulating this question. In addition, author David A. Thomas, succinctly defines L-D as a mixture of "several different events . . . persuasive speaking, extemporaneous speaking, and debate" (5). Determining what, in fact, L-D really is would be an interesting study to make.

A third area of interest concerning L-D debate involves the impact the new U.I.L. rule will have on the participation in both L-D and team debate. According to U.I.L. Director, Janet Wiman, district, regional, and state tournaments (in 1987) will permit a student to enter L-D debate and one other event, while a team debater is permitted to participate in team debate only (interview). Since, for many schools, tournaments serve to prepare the student for U.I.L. competition, the question arises as to whether students will now opt for L-D, so that they can enter more events in U.I.L. competition. The decrease in team debate participation is expected, but this drop is not necessarily a foregone conclusion. A comparison of several years' participation is a study worthy of consideration.

Another uncertainty within L-D debate focuses on the connection L-D has with individual events. If a link in the success of L-D debate and an extemporaneous speaker or orator exists, and if

that relationship has stimulated success for either L-D or the individual event, an investigation could determine to what extent the student's success is influenced. A forensic scholar could chart the achievement of individual events as related to L-D participation over the six years of competition.

An inquiry concerning the effect the change of topics in L-D has upon the forensic student is another vital consideration. This study could weigh the values of researching a number of subjects as opposed to considering one topic throughout the year. Participation of students, the educational benefits, and the requirements of coaching are pertinent areas of consideration.

Finally, a study of the techniques and strategies vital to teaching L-D debate is warranted. As the activity of L-D increases and more schools offer L-D to the students, an explanation of L-D principles is needed. The emphasis of analysis on presentation could be addressed as well as the skills of argumentation required of the L-D debater. As Texas debate teachers attempt to understand how to coach L-D, the study of the best teaching methods could be of immense value.

Not all Texas forensic coaches choose to participate in L-D debate. They feel that team debate offers more in-depth research opportunities and greater analysis skills. On the other hand, these teachers view L-D as a comparatively new type of discourse that demands less reasoning and proof. Nevertheless, interest is increasing in Lincoln-Douglas debate, and participation is growing in the state of Texas. These facts are apparent from this

study's survey and telephone interviews used in obtaining information for this writing. Only time will tell if L-D debate is here to stay; but from all indicators available at this time, the future of L-D appears to be a bright one. As L-D debate continues to develop, it offers an enhancement to the forensic program, an alternative to team debate. For certain, L-D has experienced a healthy reception, and enthusiasm for the event is spreading throughout the state of Texas.

WORKS CITED CHAPTER IV

- Thomas, David A. Lincoln-Douglas Debate. Kansas City: Nat.
Fed. of State H. S. Assocs., 1981.
- Wiman, Janet. Telephone Interview. 7 July 1986.

APPENDIX A
INTEREST FACTORS AS RELATED TO
COACH EXPERIENCE

APPENDIX B

LETTERS

SURVEY ON INTEREST IN LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

Please answer this brief questionnaire concerning Lincoln-Douglas Debate. Your responses are guaranteed to be completely confidential.

1. NAME _____
2. SCHOOL AFFILIATION _____
3. My school is a: 62 Public; or 3 Private School
4. 8.71 number of years coaching in high school
3.93 number of years coaching in middle school
5. Currently my squad is:

<u>10</u>	between 1 and 10 students
<u>31</u>	between 11 and 25 students
<u>22</u>	between 26 and 50 students
<u>3</u>	above 50 students
6. My team attends approximately 10.9 tournaments per year.
7. Our speech budget is:

<u>15</u>	below \$1000.00
<u>7</u>	between \$1000.00 and \$2000.00
<u>25</u>	between \$2000.00 and \$4000.00
<u>18</u>	over \$4000.00
8. Is your school a member of TFA? (circle one) yes 59 no 6
9. Does your squad enter Cross-Examination Debate? (circle one)
yes 50 no 15
10. Does your squad enter Lincoln-Douglas Debate? (circle one)
yes 58 no 7
11. 3.66 number of years you competed in high school and/or college forensics?
12. Has interest in Lincoln-Douglas Debate increased in your program? (circle one) yes 55 no 10

Of the following ten factors, please rank in order of importance why your squad is most interested in Lincoln-Douglas Debate. (Number 1 will be the most important)

APPENDIX C
TELEPHONE INTERVIEW

ONE YEAR--SIX TEACHERS (9%)

Question	Average of respondents	Rank
13. Rank in order of importance (Number 1 is the most important)		
1. Cost of attending--entry fees	8.83	10
2. Cost of providing materials (duplicating)	8.66	9
3. Decreased speed of delivery	6.16	6
4. Ease with which young students understand the activity	2.33	1
5. Value derived from studying more than one topic per year	3.66	3
6. Interest of your students in the activity	4.50	5
7. Gain for student who has other activities and does not want a partner depending on him/her	3.50	2
8. Minimizes coaching time	7.00	8
9. Merit of emphasis on persuasive speaking	3.66	3
10. Enhancement of other forensic activities	6.66	7

TWO TO TEN YEARS--FORTY-FOUR TEACHERS (67%)

Question	Average of respondents	Rank
13. Rank in order of importance (Number 1 is the most important)		
1. Cost of attending--entry fees	8.60	9
2. Cost of providing materials (duplicating)	7.96	8
3. Decreased speed of delivery	5.15	6
4. Ease with which young students understand the activity	2.90	1
5. Value derived from studying more than one topic per year	5.06	5
6. Interest of your students in the activity	3.80	3
7. Gain for student who has other activities and does not want a partner depending on him/her	3.75	2
8. Minimizes coaching time	8.69	10
9. Merit of emphasis on persuasive speaking	4.00	4
10. Enhancement of other forensic activities	5.60	7

ELEVEN TO TWENTY YEARS--FIFTEEN TEACHERS (23%)

Question	Average of respondents	Rank
13. Rank in order of importance (Number 1 is the most important)		
1. Cost of attending--entry fees	9.21	10
2. Cost of providing materials (duplicating)	8.35	8
3. Decreased speed of delivery	4.71	6
4. Ease with which young students understand the activity	3.57	4
5. Value derived from studying more than one topic per year	3.42	2
6. Interest of your students in the activity	4.57	5
7. Gain for student who has other activities and does not want a partner depending on him/her	3.35	1
8. Minimizes coaching time	8.71	9
9. Merit of emphasis on persuasive speaking	3.50	3
10. Enhancement of other forensic activities	5.35	7

TWENTY TO THIRTY YEARS--FOUR TEACHERS (6%)

Question	Average of respondents	Rank
13. Rank in order of importance (Number 1 is the most important)		
1. Cost of attending--entry fees	9.75	10
2. Cost of providing materials (duplicating)	8.50	9
3. Decreased speed of delivery	4.00	3
4. Ease with which young students understand the activity	3.50	2
5. Value derived from studying more than one topic per year	4.50	5
6. Interest of your students in the activity	4.00	3
7. Gain for student who has other activities and does not want a partner depending on him/her	4.50	5
8. Minimizes coaching time	8.25	8
9. Merit of emphasis on persuasive speaking	3.25	1
10. Enhancement of other forensic activities	4.75	7

THIRTY YEARS AND OVER--TWO TEACHERS (3%)

Question	Average of respondents	Rank
13. Rank in order of importance (Number 1 is the most important)		
1. Cost of attending--entry fees	9.50	10
2. Cost of providing materials (duplicating)	7.50	8
3. Decreased speed of delivery	3.50	4
4. Ease with which young students understand the activity	4.50	6
5. Value derived from studying more than one topic per year	2.50	1
6. Interest of your students in the activity	2.50	1
7. Gain for student who has other activities and does not want a partner depending on him/her	4.00	5
8. Minimizes coaching time	9.00	9
9. Merit of emphasis on persuasive speaking	2.50	1
10. Enhancement of other forensic activities	7.00	7

Laura B. Baxter
602 Colonial Drive
Garland, Texas 75043

Kandi King
3522 Oaksheath
San Antonio, Texas 78247

Dear Kandi,

I enjoyed visiting with you at Nationals. We had such a good time!

As I told you, my thesis is on Lincoln-Douglas debate in Texas. If possible, could you please send me the number of entries for the past three years. I need to know if, in truth, a growth in interest has occurred, and the number of entries will be of great assistance to me.

I truly appreciate your help. Good luck at Clark next year.

Yours truly,

Laura B. Baxter

LBB/jdb

Laura B. Baxter
602 Colonial Drive
Garland, Texas 75043

Dear Colleague,

I am doing a survey on the increase of interest in Lincoln-Douglas debate. Will you please take a moment and fill out the enclosed survey sheet? Your comments will be completely confidential.

Yours truly,

Laura Baxter

8. Is there a textbook you employ in your teaching?

yes

no

(Name of text _____)

(What about the textbook is particularly helpful?)

9. How much assistance do you personally give to an L-D student or do you find he or she is fairly independent in preparation?

Assistance _____

Independent _____

10. Do you hold practice rounds in L-D before each contest?

yes

no

11. How does the sharing of evidence on your squad work?

12. Is there an increase in interest in L-D within your own program? yes no

13. Why do you think this increase [or lack of] is occurring?

14. What do you find to be the most valuable aspect of L-D debate? _____

3. Do judges demand a difference in speaking style of L-D debaters as opposed to two-person debate?

yes

no

4. Do you find that a proficient L-D student succeeds in other contests as a result of the L-D background?

yes

no

JUDGING

1. What wins in an L-D debate? _____

2. Is accomplished speaking more important than evidence?

yes

no

3. Do you flow when you judge? yes no

4. What type of person do you believe should be able to judge L-D? _____

5. Since a person's values are being debated, do you think that finding an unbiased judge is a problem? yes no

How do you personally feel about the future of L-D debate in Texas? _____

WORKS CONSULTED

- Adkins, Carl, and J. E. Masters. Lincoln-Douglas Debate Handbook. Austin: U. I. L. Div. of Cont. Ed., 1985.
- Allen, R. R., Sharol Parish, and C. David Morterer. Communication: Interacting Through Speech. Columbus: Merrill, 1974.
- Angle, Paul M., and Earl Schenck Miers, ed. The Living Lincoln The Man, His Mind, His Times, and the War He Fought, Reconstructed From His Own Writings. New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 1955.
- Balthrop, Bill and Donn W. Parson. A High School Debater's Manual. Lawrence: Div. of Continuing Ed., 1978.
- Berquist, Goodwin F., and James L. Golden. "Media Rhetoric, Criticism and the Public Perception of the 1980 Presidential Debates." Quarterly Journal of Speech 67 Sept. 1981: 125- 137.
- Bosmajian, Haig A., ed. Readings in Speech. New York: Harper, 1965.
- Braden, Waldo W. Public Speaking, The Essentials. New York: Harper, 1966.
- Capps, Randall, and J. Regis O'Connor. Fundamentals of Effective Speech Communication. Cambridge: Winthrop, 1978.
- Colburn, C. William. Strategies for Educational Debate. Boston: Holbrook, 1972.

- Day, Patti. Telephone interview. 1 July 1986.
- Dennis, Frank L. The Lincoln-Douglas Debates. New York: Mason, 1978.
- Elson, E. F., Alberta Peck, et al. The Art of Speaking. Boston: Ginn, 1966.
- English, Charlotte. Telephone interview. 6 July 1986.
- Evans, Mark. Telephone interview. 24 July 1986.
- Freeley, Austin J. Argumentation and Debate. Belmont: Wadsworth, 1981.
- Friedman, Barbara. Telephone interview. 1 July 1986.
- Fryar, Maridell and David A. Thomas. Basic Debate. Skokie: National Textbook, 1982.
- . Student Congress and Lincoln-Douglas Debate. Skokie: National Textbook, 1981.
- Grice, George L., and Edwin W. Knaak, Jr. Lincoln-Douglas for Novices. San Antonio: The Texas Group, 1985.
- Grice, George L., and John F. Skinner, eds. The Trinity Papers. San Antonio: Trinity U., 1982.
- Griffin, Francis, Catherine Nelson, and Edward Stasheff. Your Speech. New York: Harcourt, 1960.
- Hibbs, Paul, et al., eds. Speech for Today. New York: McGraw, 1965.
- Howe, Jack H., et al., eds. CEDA Yearbook. Cross Exam. Debate Assoc., 1982.
- . Contributions on the Philosophy and Practice of CEDA. Cross Exam. Debate Assoc., 1981.

- Kemp, Robert L. Lincoln-Douglas Debating. Clayton: Alan, 1984.
- King, Kandi. Telephone interview. 9 July 1986.
- Kraus, Sidney, ed. The Great Debate Carter vs. Ford. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1979.
- Matlon, Ronald J. "Debating Propositions of Value." Journal of the American Forensic Association 14 Spring, 1978: 194-204.
- McBeth, James H., ed. Forensics as Communication. Skokie: Nat. Textbook, 1975.
- McCall, Dale. "Extremism in the Pursuit of Lincoln-Douglas Debate is a Vice." The Rostrum 60 Oct. 1985: 8-9.
- McCarty, Larry. Telephone interview. 3 July 1986.
- McCoy, Rose. "The Repeat Game or The Speech Coach's Eternal Puzzle." The Rostrum 57 Feb. 1983: 12-13.
- Miers, Earl Schenck. Abraham Lincoln In Peace and War. New York: Amer. Heritage, 1964.
- Miller, Timothy M., and Tim Sommers. "Lincoln-Douglas Debate Is 'Debate'." The Rostrum 57 Jan. 1983: 10-12.
- . "The Analysis of Value Propositions and Values." The Rostrum 57 Mar. 1983: 4-7.
- Monroe, Alan H., and Douglas Ehninger. Principles of Speech. Chicago: Scott, Foresman, 1962.
- Murphy, James J. and Jon M. Ericson. The Debater's Guide. New York: Merrill, 1961.

- Musgrave, George McCoy. Competition Debate. New York: Wilson, 1957.
- Newcombe, P. Judson. Communicating Message and Meaning. Lexington: Ginn, 1982.
- Oates, Stephen B. Abraham Lincoln The Man Behind the Myths. New York: NAL, 1985.
- Odom, Albert. "N F L Lincoln-Douglas Debate Institute." The Rostrum 59 Nov. 1984: 4.
- Patterson, J. W., and David Zarefsky. Contemporary Debate. Boston: Houghton, 1983.
- Perelman, Chaim, and L. Olbrechts-Tyteca. The New Rhetoric. Notre Dame: U of Notre Dame Press, 1971.
- Pinkus, Craig. "Are We Teaching Debaters Good Communication Skills?" The Rostrum 59 Dec. 1984: 4-5.
- Polk, Lee R., William B. English, and Erik Walker. The Value Debate Handbook. Waco: Baylor Briefs, 1985.
- Reid, Ronald F., ed. Introduction to the Field of Speech. Chicago: Scott, Foresman, 1965.
- Rieke, R. and M. Sillars. Argumentation and the Decision Making Process. New York: Harcourt, 1981.
- Schanker, Harry H. The Spoken Word. New York: McGraw, 1982.
- Sexton, Mechelle. Telephone interview. 27 July 1986.
- Shofner, Ann. Telephone interview. 8 July 1986.
- Smith, Maury. A Practical Guide to Value Clarification. La Jolla: U. Assoc., 1977.

- Southworth, William. "Thoughts on Evidence Reading and Comprehension." Journal of the American Forensic Association XXL (Summer) 1984: 52-54.
- Terry, Donald R., et al., eds. Modern Debate Case Techniques. Skokie: National Textbook, 1981.
- Thomas, Benjamin P. Abraham Lincoln. New York: Knopf, 1962.
- Thomas, David A., ed. Advanced Debate Readings in Theory, Practice, and Teaching. Skokie: National Textbook, 1975.
- . Lincoln-Douglas Debate. Kansas City: National Fed. of State H. S. Assocs., 1981.
- Warnick, Barbara. "Arguing Value Propositions." Journal of the American Forensic Association 18 Fall 1981: 109-119.
- Williams, Don and John Rex Wier. A Guide for High School Debaters. Austin: Div. of Cont. Ed., 1979.
- Wiman, Janet. Telephone interview. 7 July 1986.
- Winders, Russel R. and Arthur Hastings. Argumentation and Advocacy. New York: Random, 1966.
- Winfield, Dennis. "A Step Toward Sanity." The Rostrum 54 Jan. 1980: 7-8.
- . "From the Executive Secretary." The Rostrum 54 Dec. 1979: 2-3.
- Young, Marilyn J. Coaching Debate. Clayton: Alan, 1979.
- Zarefsky, David. "The Lincoln-Douglas Debates Revisited: The Evolution of Public Argument." Quarterly Journal of Speech 72 May 1986: 162-184.