

RECEIVED  
AUG 5 1976  
M. T. S. U. LIBRARY

**THE JOURNAL OF THE  
TENNESSEE SPEECH COMMUNICATION ASSOCIATION**

published by  
THE TENNESSEE SPEECH COMMUNICATION ASSOCIATION

**Fall 1975**

**Volume I**

**Number II**

THE JOURNAL OF THE  
TENNESSEE SPEECH COMMUNICATION ASSOCIATION

published by  
The Tennessee Speech Communication Association

---

VOLUME I

NUMBER II

---

CONTENTS	Page
DAVY CROCKETT: THE SPEAKER AND THE IMAGE Sandra L. Fish	4
THE EFFECTS OF SEX ON EVALUATIONS IN INTERCOLLEGIATE DEBATE Sidney R. Hill, Jr.	21
CURRENT DEBATE AND PUBLIC POLICY ANALYSIS Michael Hall	36
TSCA 1975 SPEAKER OF THE YEAR	46
MINUTES OF THE TSCA EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING September 27, 1975	47
SPEECH COMMUNICATION ACTIVITIES ACROSS THE STATE	49

THE JOURNAL OF THE  
TENNESSEE SPEECH COMMUNICATION ASSOCIATION

published by

The Tennessee Speech Communication Association

Richard Dean, President	East Tennessee State University
Kassian Kovalcheck, Vice-President	Vanderbilt University
John J. Conner, Executive Secretary	Middle Tennessee State University

Interest Group Chairpersons

Harold Baker Broadcasting	Middle Tennessee State University
------------------------------	-----------------------------------

Valerie Schneider Curriculum	East Tennessee State University
---------------------------------	---------------------------------

Dick Finton Forensics	Carson-Newman College
--------------------------	-----------------------

Faye Julian Interpretation	University of Tennessee Knoxville
-------------------------------	--------------------------------------

Ralph Hillman Interpersonal and Group Communication	Middle Tennessee State University
--	-----------------------------------

Al Yeomans Rhetoric and Public Address	University of Tennessee Knoxville
---	--------------------------------------

Betsy Mashburn Theater	West High School Knoxville
---------------------------	-------------------------------

Journal Staff

Jim Brooks Editor and Director of Publications	Middle Tennessee State University
---	-----------------------------------

Publications Committee

Randall Fisher	Vanderbilt University
Valerie Schneider	East Tennessee State University
Helen White	Motlow State Community College

THE JOURNAL OF THE  
TENNESSEE SPEECH COMMUNICATION ASSOCIATION

PATRONS

AUSTIN PEAY STATE UNIVERSITY  
CARSON-NEWMAN COLLEGE  
DAVID LIPSCOMB COLLEGE  
EAST TENNESSEE STATE UNIVERSITY  
MIDDLE TENNESSEE STATE UNIVERSITY  
MOTLOW STATE COMMUNITY COLLEGE  
UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE AT KNOXVILLE  
TENNESSEE TEMPLE COLLEGE  
VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY

# DAVY CROCKETT: THE SPEAKER AND THE IMAGE

Sandra L. Fish

The history of the United States is replete with heroes of varying sorts, ranging from the martyred President John F. Kennedy, back through humorist Will Rogers and orator Daniel Webster, to the rip-roaring backwoodsman Davy Crockett. The American hero characteristically projected an image which caught the imagination of those who knew him, an image which became for later generations the real man.

David Crockett was a frontiersman, a husband and father, a bear hunter, a state representative, a Congressman, and a martyr. His reputation and the image he presented was created, to a great degree, by his speaking. Because of his appeal, he was elected to both state and national legislatures. The purpose of this paper is to demonstrate how Crockett's appeal through his public speaking fostered the development of his image as frontiersman, clever hero, philosopher, demigod, and martyr.

## Crockett's Public Speaking

Davy Crockett's success as a speaker was due to his identification with his constituents of the backwoods. Kenneth Burke suggests that one can "persuade a man only insofar as you can talk his language by speech, gesture, tonality, order, image,

attitude, idea, identifying your ways with his."<sup>1</sup> As the embodiment of the American frontier values, Crockett achieved consubstantiality with his audiences by the persuasive presentation of himself, his attitudes, and his beliefs.

The first step in Crockett's rise to political fame was his election as magistrate in the Tennessee community of Shoal Creek where he developed his famous motto, "Be always sure you're right, then go ahead." Although he had read no law books, he impressed his neighbors with sound judgments. When he began his career as a legislator, he continued to promote the idea that he was as innocent of "high-falutin'" city talk as were his neighbors.

In 1821 during his first campaign for state legislator from the same area, he attended a frolic where both candidates were asked to speak. In his autobiography he described in detail the occasion, his reactions, and his speech:

A public document I had never seen, nor did I know there were such things; and how to begin I couldn't tell. I made many apologies, and tried to get off . . . . I tried to speak about something, and I cared very little what, until I choaked up as bad as if my mouth had been jamm'd and cramm'd chock full of dry mush . . . . At last I told them I was like a fellow I had heard of not long before. He was beating on the head of an empty barrel near the roadside, when a traveler, who was passing along, asked what he was doing that for? The fellow replied that there was some cider in that barrel a few days before, and he was trying to see if there was any then, but if there was he couldn't get at it. I told them that there had been a little bit of speech in me a while ago, but I believed I couldn't get it out. They all roared out in a mighty laugh.<sup>2</sup>

Pleased with Crockett's humorous tales, the voters found it easy to identify with their peer -- nervous, homely in manner and dress, unknowledgeable about governmental affairs.

Crockett had no difficulty in being reelected in 1823 from his western Tennessee district near Reelfoot lake. His tactics, recorded by Walter Blair, were designed to identify himself with the voters:

When he ran for the next session, he walked into a meeting and said to the crowd, "I don't want it understood that I've come electioneering. I've just crept out of the cane to see what discoveries I can make among the white folks." But he gave the voters chaws of tobacco and drinks of whisky, he told them some more good yarns, and he won again.<sup>3</sup>

In the election for the United States Congress in 1827, while campaigning against Colonel Alexander and General Arnold, Crockett stated that his two competitors seemed afraid of each other but ignored him in their speeches:

They, therefore, were generally working against each other, while I was going ahead for myself, and mixing among the people in the best way I could. I was as cunning as a little red fox, and wouldn't risk my tail in a "commital trap."<sup>4</sup>

Crockett had always been a likeable fellow, quick with a witty remark; he was especially adept at taking advantage of opportunities for his personal benefit. One such occasion occurred during this campaign when the three competitors appeared on the same platform to speak. Davy, scheduled first, spoke briefly and was then followed first by Alexander and

then by Arnold. Crockett gave the following account:

The general took much pains to reply to Alexander, and didn't so much as let on that there was any such candidate as myself at all. He had been speaking for a considerable time, when a large flock of guinea-fowls came very near to where he was, and set up the most unmerciful chattering that ever was heard . . . . They so confused the general, that he made a stop, and requested that they might be driven away . . . . I told him that he had not the politeness to name me in his speech, and that when my little friends, the guinea-fowls, had come up and began to holler, "Crockett, Crockett, Crockett," he had been ungenerous enough to stop, and drive them all away. This raised a universal shout among the people for me, and the general seemed mighty bad plagued.<sup>5</sup>

The voters were pleased with the ability of a candidate to outsmart another; this was evidence of "natural ability" and required no "book learning" to accomplish.

Crockett continued this campaign with funny stories, frequently passing around horns of whiskey, "not to get elected of course," he said righteously, "for that would be against the law; but just . . . to make themselves and their friends feel their keeping a little."<sup>6</sup> His audiences approved.

His first important speaking occasion in Congress arose after his reelection in 1829 with the discussion of the problem of land speculation in which Crockett strove for low prices and long-term payments on the land for the benefit of the settlers. He opposed the majority, including his one-time idol Andrew Jackson. Constance Rourke, one of Crockett's biographers, records excerpts from Crockett's speech to the House concerning the plight of the settlers:



Their little all . . . is to be wrested from them for the purposes of speculation, and a swindling machine is to be set up to strip them of what little the surveyors and the warrant holders have left them. It shall never be said that I sat by in silence!<sup>7</sup>

Doubtlessly his constituents appreciated his efforts in their behalf, but they saw even more clearly that he had failed. The cause of the settlers had been dealt a severe blow with the defeat of Crockett's suggestions. Rourke credits Crockett with a unique understanding of the implications of this issue, remarking that:

. . . in a most vital relationship, that of an eager people to the new, rich land, equal opportunity did not exist. Crockett himself could not have judged of the final results of this blow . . . . Few seemed able to perceive the relation of an equitable land ownership to the purposes of a democracy. None the less Crockett stands head and shoulders above the average thinker of the time, even above many in high places, because of his grasp of a fundamental principle and his willingness to fight for it.<sup>8</sup>

A second major issue eliciting speeches from Crockett was the problem of the disposal of Indian lands. President Jackson had proposed a bill to remove the five tribes of the Southwest to areas west of the Mississippi River, even though this violated the treaty. Crockett, risking his own political career, vigorously opposed Jackson. Friends discouraged his opposition to the powerful President, but he replied:

I'll wear no man's collar. Long ago I fixed on a motto. That motto is "Be always sure you're right, then go ahead." I follow it to this day, and I shall always follow it, come what will. The President is wrong about the Indians, and I know it.<sup>9</sup>

Davy was the only Tennessee delegate against the bill:

I know I stand alone from my state . . . . None of my colleagues agree with my sentiment, but if I should be the only member of the House who voted against the bill and the only man in the United States who disapproved of it, I would still vote against, and it would be a matter of rejoicing till the day I died that I did so.<sup>10</sup>

Furthermore, Crockett was not really representing his constituents for most of them were either opposed or indifferent to the issue. With homely expressions he stood his ground, but to no avail. Even though he was supported by many people in the North and East, by the Society of Friends, and by many lawyers, Jackson's influence prevailed and the tribes were removed. Moreover, Crockett had displeased his constituents on two counts: he had failed in his attempt to secure low land prices, and he had not represented them on the Indian issue. He lost the election in 1831.

Crockett rallied, however, and was reelected in 1833. During this term of office his major speaking occasions arose on his tour to the Northeast. Everywhere he went he addressed cheering crowds as the toast of the Whig party, for he was an ex-Jackson supporter who could appeal to the coonskin voters. Although Crockett did not consider himself affiliated with any political party, he had in fact aligned himself with the Whigs merely by opposing Jackson. He was interesting to the northerners also because he was a prime example of a frontiersman,

a Tennessee backwoodsman. Vernon Parrington's analysis is revealing:

Popular imagination seized upon him and endowed the mighty hunter of the canebrakes with the fugitive romance that had been gathering for years. He was erected into a mythical figure that drew to itself the unappropriated picturesque that sprang spontaneously from the crude western life.<sup>11</sup>

Everything Crockett did on this tour was material for newspaper articles. His speeches were reprinted, although Parrington suggests they quite probably were revised beforehand.<sup>12</sup> As a result of the tour, Crockett became nationally famous. Some historians claim that he was exploited by the Whigs to counteract the Jackson influence.<sup>13</sup> Rourke denies this,<sup>14</sup> but regardless of whether or not he was used as a political pawn, the crowds approved of him.

Using an appropriation bill as a point of departure, Crockett gave one of his last speeches to the Congress in June 1834, aiming his speech primarily at Andrew Jackson:

I now believe we ought to lay this bill on the table, too, and all other appropriation bills. Sir, it is useless to pass appropriation bills . . . . What have we seen, sir? We have seen him seize the treasury of this country, and remove it from where the law had placed it; and I now ask any gentleman of this House to satisfy me why the same law that will authorize him to take the money from where the law had placed it, will not bear him out in also distributing it where he pleases? . . . Sir, I do not consider it good sense to be sitting here passing laws for Andrew Jackson to laugh at; it is not even good nonsense. Sir, what does he care for your laws or the constitution? He is the Government, and his will is the law of the land . . . . Sir, the people will let him know that he is not the Government. I hope to live to see better times.<sup>15</sup>

Crockett had opposed Jackson as early as 1829; each year had brought more subjects for dissension between them. While Crockett was popular, Jackson controlled the party machinery. Davy was severely defeated in 1835 and immediately left for Texas.

Although Crockett was no longer in office, his fame and popularity did not die; in fact, they grew to great proportions. His humor and wit were emphasized, his homely speech exaggerated. Tales were circulated about Davy and his exploits which while mostly fictional were nevertheless consistent with his reputation. A combination of forces, chief among which was his speaking, united to make Davy Crockett famous. He appealed to the voters as "just plain folks" on grounds other than intellectual. He used "every available means of persuasion" including wit and humor, liquor and tobacco, ridicule, sharp-shooting, and hunting stories. Yet, once elected, he did not take lightly his duties as a representative. His impassioned, sincere rhetoric in Congress won recognition; and he achieved a homely statesmanship. He spoke to cheering throngs on his tour and was greatly admired. As Kenneth Porter suggests, "Davy Crockett . . . was a man about whom legends began to cluster even in his lifetime."<sup>16</sup>

#### THE INFLUENCE OF THE SPEAKING ON THE CROCKETT IMAGE

"Hero-worship answers an urgent American need," says Dixon Wecter. "Homage to heroes is a vital part of our

patriotism."<sup>17</sup> Crockett was a frontiersman who achieved the status of hero. Upon him were bestowed all the qualities befitting such a figure, and his popularity knew no bounds. In describing the Crockett legend, Rourke states:

The Crockett stories even distantly approached the realm of the epic, not merely because of the persistent effect of the scale or because of their theme of wandering adventure, but because they embodied something of those interwoven destinies of gods and men which have the great epical substance. The tales were brief and scattered; the bias was comic; a perverse and wayward spirit was abroad.<sup>18</sup>

The Crockett image is composed of many facets, each of which overlaps the other. It will be profitable to analyze this image and see how his speaking affected its various parts.

### Frontiersman

"It was a fiction of the time," writes Walter Blair, "that, just as all Scotchmen were stingy, all frontiersmen were both wonderful in their capacity for drink and boastful in their talk."<sup>19</sup> B. A. Botkin goes into greater detail in describing the image of the American frontiersman:

A composite picture of the American hero would show him to be a plain, tough, practical fellow, equally good at a bargain or a fight, a star-performer on the job and a hell-raiser off it, and something of a salesman and a showman, with a flair for prodigious stories, jokes, and stunts and a general capacity for putting himself over. Our nearest approach to a national myth, explaining and justifying the many contradictions in our heroes, is the frontier or pioneer myth. This reconciles the primitive virtues of brute strength, courage, and cunning with the economic virtues of thrift, hard work, and perseverance.

The backwoodsman was the first of our tall men, whose words were tall talk and whose deeds were tall tales.<sup>20</sup>

Davy Crockett was a prime example of the backwoodsman with his tall talk and tall tales. His speeches, usually interlaced with stories of hunting and fighting exploits, had little to say of governmental matters and made use of humor and witty remarks. Handy with a gun, Crockett often combined speaking engagements and shooting matches. Because Crockett was a genuine backwoodsman, he appealed to his fellows, becoming recognized as a tall-talking, whiskey-drinking, coon-grinning frontiersman.

### Comic Clever Hero

In describing the American hero, Max Eastman says:

These American heroes are not distinguished by size, but by humor. All mythical heroes have been exaggerations, but they have been serious ones. America came too late for that. Her demigods were born in laughter; they are consciously preposterous; they are cockalorum demigods. That is the natively American thing -- not that her primitive humor is exaggerative; but that her primitive exaggerations were humorous.<sup>21</sup>

Humor and comedy are a tradition in America. Sociologist Orrin Klapp describes the tradition of the clever hero:

Whether it is . . . Robin Hood escaping from the Sheriff of Nottingham or Davy Crockett outwitting his backwoods opponents with a trick, the victory of the clever hero is discernible. He either vanquishes or escapes from a formidable opponent by a ruse.<sup>22</sup>

That a major facet of the Crockett image is the comic clever hero is suggested by Boykin:

Although in his own day Crockett's name was a household word for his jokes as well as his achievements, the image of the "Colonel" that endures to-day is not that of a national political figure or the martyr of the Alamo, but that of the comic backwoodsman.<sup>23</sup>

Crockett's speaking contributed to this aspect of his image; his abundant use of humor and witty stories and his ability to outsmart his opponents on the speaker's stand as well as off stood him in good stead with his backwoods audiences. "The heroes . . . never stopped cracking jokes,"<sup>24</sup> remarks Malcolm Cowley; and Crockett offers a classic example. Davy's use of humor and wit revealed assumptions common to both speaker and audience and aided the establishment of his image.

### Coonskin Philosopher

The coonskin or crackerbox philosopher in America is a person who in homey, down-to-earth language expresses the common sense and deeper intuitions of the people. Many of our comic heroes have also been crackerbox philosopher, such as Abe Lincoln, Will Rogers, and Davy Crockett. Many of Crockett's sayings were circulated with his stories, as examples of "horse sense." The most famous of all his rustic maxims was his motto, "Be always sure you're right, then go ahead." Because it was appropriate for a new nation, and especially fitting for a frontier community, this proverb appealed to people. Often the stories that Crockett told in his speeches exemplified some homely adage; for example, he told a Philadelphia audience that as long as General Jackson went straight:

. . . I followed him; but when he began to go this way, and that way, and every way, I wouldn't go after him; like the boy whose master ordered him to plough

across the field to the red cow. Well, he began to plough and she began to walk; and he ploughed all forenoon after her. So when the master came, he swore at him for going so crooked. "Why, sir," said the boy, "you told me to plough to the red cow, and I kept after her, but she always kept moving."<sup>25</sup>

Commenting on Crockett as a philosopher, Botkin compares him to Lincoln:

In his role of cracker-box philosopher and story-telling politician, the coonskin Congressman anticipates Lincoln, although with Crockett story-telling was a business rather than an art -- the business of being a wag and a good fellow.<sup>26</sup>

### Demigod

Like the legends surrounding William F. Cody ("Buffalo Bill"), John Henry, Jonathan Chapman ("Johnny Appleseed"), and Daniel Webster ("Black Dan"), the stories about Davy Crockett grew into gigantic proportions. These tall tales picture Crockett as killing bears at the age of three, being weaned on rattlesnakes' eggs and whiskey, catching a comet by the tail, and ultimately greasing the frozen axis of the earth with bear grease. Blair's comments on these tales about Davy are instructive:

During Crockett's lifetime, and particularly after his heroic death in the Alamo in 1836, tall tales about him circulated in yarn-spinning sessions and in print. He was pictured in such tales as a comic demigod, doing superhuman deeds imagined by exuberant storytellers. These tales combined imagination of the sort one finds in poetry with enough robust humor to make them palatable to ordinary men. They are related to the earlier whoppers of Samuel Peters, the later yarns of Mark Twain, and the present-day fantastic moving pictures of Walt Disney.<sup>27</sup>



Because Crockett was by nature and environment boastful, it was a natural consequence that legends about him should boast of his greatness. But the boasting and bragging which was characteristic of Crockett's speaking never reached the bounds of the legends which sprang up after his death.

### Martyr

Many of America's heroes, such as Abraham Lincoln, Nathan Hale, Jim Bowie, and John Kennedy, have been martyrs.

Klapp suggests the significance of the hero's death:

Heroic deaths have two common themes: voluntary sacrifice for a cause and defeat by treachery . . . . The martyred heroes usually die fighting for a cause against superior enemies or are persecuted by a powerful tyrant . . . . We may recall some of the most familiar forms of legendary betrayal; Davy Crockett was stabbed in the back while defending the Alamo.<sup>28</sup>

There have been many accounts of the manner of Crockett's death, but it is generally accepted that he was killed during the fighting at the Alamo.

Much of Davy's speaking foreshadowed his actions in Texas. His staunch defense of the settler against land speculation and his total opposition to unfair treatment of the Indians in the face of political ruin are quite in harmony with his stand for freedom and democracy in San Antonio. Crockett's martyrdom was the final star in the crown of one who had already endeared himself to the hearts of many Americans. Stories about Crockett's death emphasized

his willingness to sacrifice himself; he is reputed to be the first man to "step across the line" and volunteer to remain in the face of overwhelming odds. Virgil Baugh describes Davy's role as martyr:

There have been countless eulogies of the heroes who fell at the Alamo -- Travis, Bowie, Crockett, and others -- but Davy Crockett dominates them all in the affections of the American people . . . . The reasons are not hard to find . . . . His quick wit, his droll stories, his cunning in outwitting men who were far better educated and more sophisticated than he, his innate sense of justice and fair play, his bravery . . . endear him to us now as they did to his contemporaries. He rightfully belongs to the company of those frontiersmen and heroes who helped to formulate, as they best expressed them, the basic aims and ideals of American democracy.<sup>29</sup>

#### CONCLUSION

The Crockett image is a many-sided picture. Known as a frontiersman, a bear-hunter, an Indian fighter, a Congressman, a comic storyteller, a coonskin philosopher, a martyr, and a demigod, Davy presents a composite representing many of the ideals and values of the American people of his time. His speaking contributed to this image in many ways -- through his funny stories, his wise sayings, and his bitter debates in Congress. The image was created by a number of forces, his own public speaking being chief among them because it revealed the values and aspirations that Crockett shared with his audiences.

The publishers of his autobiography provide an accurate

summary:

. . . the tall, buckskin-clad, coonskin-capped figure of Davy Crockett caught the public imagination in his own time as it does today. In the forests and along the rivers of the frontier, he was the best of his breed; bear-killer extraordinary, tireless, fearless, a man who could peel the bark off a tree with his grin or tame the lightning in the sky. In the halls of Congress, in the newspapers of Eastern cities, among the crowds that clamored to hear him speak during his tour of the northeast, he was the epitome of the frontier type, the unpolished backwoods wit and talespinner, the "rip-tail snorter, the yeller flower of the forest, half-horse and half-alligator," who could "swim further, dive deeper and come up dryer" than any other man in his district. Davy Crockett was "America's first 'Superman.'"<sup>30</sup>

The name of Davy Crockett is well known today; his words and his legends have survived a century and still serve to amuse and inspire us.

NOTES

Sandra L. Fish (Ph. D., Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, 1975) is Assistant Professor of Speech and Theater at the University of Tennessee at Knoxville. This paper is based on her master's thesis directed by David M. Berg, University of Oklahoma, 1965.

<sup>1</sup>Kenneth Burke, A Grammar of Motives and A Rhetoric of Motives (Cleveland: The World Publishing Company, 1962), p. 579.

<sup>2</sup>David Crockett, The Life of Davy Crockett (Signet edition; New York: New American Library, 1955), p. 72.

<sup>3</sup>Walter Blair, Horse Sense in American Humor (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1942), p. 32.

<sup>4</sup>Crockett, p. 103.

<sup>5</sup>Crockett, pp. 103-104.

- <sup>6</sup>Blair, p. 32.
- <sup>7</sup>Constance Rourke, Davy Crockett (New York: Harcourt Brace and Co., 1934), pp. 131-32.
- <sup>8</sup>Rourke, p. 133.
- <sup>9</sup>Rourke, p. 137.
- <sup>10</sup>Rourke, p. 135.
- <sup>11</sup>Vernon L. Parrington, Main Currents in American Thought (3 vols.; New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1927), II, p. 173.
- <sup>12</sup>Parrington, II, p. 177.
- <sup>13</sup>Parrington, II, p. 177.
- <sup>14</sup>Constance Rourke, "Davy Crockett: Forgotten Facts and Legends," Southwest Review, XIX (January, 1934), p. 153.
- <sup>15</sup>U. S., Congressional Record, 23rd Cong., 2nd Sess., 1834, X, Part 4, 4586.
- <sup>16</sup>Kenneth W. Porter, "Davy Crockett and John Horse: A Possible Origin of the Coonskin Story," American Literature, XV (March, 1943), p. 14.
- <sup>17</sup>Dixon Wecter, The Hero in America (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1941), pp. 1-2.
- <sup>18</sup>Constance Rourke, American Humor, A Study of the National Character (New York: Doubleday & Co., 1931), p. 60.
- <sup>19</sup>Blair, Horse Sense in American Humor, p. 36.
- <sup>20</sup>B. A. Botkin, ed., A Treasury of American Folklore (New York: Crown Publishers, 1944), pp. 2-3.
- <sup>21</sup>Max Eastman, Enjoyment of Laughter (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1936), p. 168.

<sup>22</sup>Orrin E. Klapp, "The Folk Hero," Journal of American Folklore, LXII (January-March, 1949), p. 20.

<sup>23</sup>Botkin, p. 6.

<sup>24</sup>Malcolm Cowley, "American Myths, Old and New," Saturday Review, September 1, 1962, p. 7.

<sup>25</sup>Crockett, p. 118.

<sup>26</sup>Botkin, p. 6.

<sup>27</sup>Walter Blair, The Literature of the United States, Walter Blair, et al., eds. (2 vols.; Chicago: Scott, Foresman & Co., 1961), II, p. 270.

<sup>28</sup>Klapp, p. 22

<sup>29</sup>Virgil E. Baugh, Rendezvous at the Alamo (New York: Pageant Press, Inc., 1960), pp. 131-32.

<sup>30</sup>Crockett, p. 262.

THE EFFECTS OF SEX ON EVALUATIONS IN  
INTERCOLLEGIATE DEBATE

Sidney R. Hill, Jr.

In the first half of this century, the organization of intercollegiate forensics left little doubt that women were seen as incapable of competing with men on equal terms. The exceptional woman might enter men's contests, but the more usual procedure was to employ separate divisions for the sexes.<sup>1</sup> Men's and women's divisions in oratory, extemporaneous speaking, oral interpretation, and debate were the rule rather than the exception.<sup>2</sup>

In the abandonment of these distinctions, however, forensics has moved ahead of the contemporary concern for the equality of women. With the growth of coeducation in institutions of higher learning, women have participated more and more in debate against men. The tournament with separate men's and women's divisions is rapidly disappearing.<sup>3</sup> Women have participated in the National Debate Tournament and have compiled outstanding records. Some of the most respected coaches in the nation are women. Women have served as officers of the major forensic honoraries and play an active part in the professional

societies. The format of contemporary debate tournaments suggests that sex is not seen as a variable which in any way affects the outcome of intercollegiate debate. Yet, recently published research tends to challenge that view.

#### PREVIOUS RESEARCH

Two studies are of immediate interest. Hensley and Strother in 1968 reported results indicating that sex does affect win-loss decisions.<sup>4</sup> They discovered that a mixed (i.e. one male, one female) team stood a "greater than random chance of winning" any given debate round.

Stimulated by the work of Hensley and Strother, Hayes and McAdoo in 1972 pursued the examination of sex as an influence on evaluations in debate.<sup>5</sup> These researchers utilized data generated by speaker rankings rather than the win-loss results employed by Hensley and Strother. A Chi-square test found significant deviation from expected results at a .01 level of significance, and the direction of the results indicated that female debaters were evaluated more highly than were male debaters.

There are a number of limiting factors in the research reported above. In the case of Hensley and Strother, the study deals only with team win-loss results. While this is of obvious importance, it does not focus directly on the evaluation of the individual debater as that evaluation is affected by sex.

The sampling procedure employed by Hayes and McAdoo raises questions as to their results. The ballots studied included all of those accumulated by three different college debate programs over a three-year span. Obviously this resulted in multiple measures of the same female and male debaters. While this procedure may give conclusive evidence of the superiority of female debaters at the schools involved, there is no basis for generalization to the entire population of female debaters.

Hayes and McAdoo also excluded from their data pool all ballots in which the competition consisted of all men or all women. Thus the possibility exists that their results were contaminated by interaction between male and female debaters.

Neither study cited made any distinction as to the sex of the judge in the round. Thus the possibility of yet another contaminating variable exists; i.e. interaction between the sex of the judge and the sex of the debater evaluated.

This study proposes to examine the influence of sex on evaluation in debate while controlling for interaction effects from the sex of the debater's colleague and the sex of the critic judge.



## METHODOLOGY

### Sampling procedures

The data for the study consisted of 2170 debate ballots collected from three different tournaments for five successive years.<sup>6</sup> In order to eliminate possible effects due to a specific debate topic, the test samples were constructed to provide equal representation for each debate year.

To avoid any possible effects of time within a tournament, the test samples were also stratified across time for early, late, and elimination round debates. It was decided to limit possible errors in estimation to no more than one point on the 5-30 point scale for speaker ratings in the estimation of sample means.<sup>7</sup>

After calculation of the variance of each of the strata, the appropriate sample size was computed to be 75 measurements. Samples for the study were drawn from the data pool by a "1 in 30" systematic sampling procedure until each stratum was filled. The allocation of the total sample across each stratum was derived by the formula  $n_i = nw_i$ .

### Dependent measures

The A.F.A. Form "C" ballot provided four different measures of outcome for each debate: win-loss decision, speaker rating, team rating, and speaker ranking. The study was replicated using each of the ballot measures as the dependent variable. The specific hypotheses tested were:

1. There is no effect due to sex in the win-loss decisions in debate.
2. There is no effect due to sex in speaker ratings in debate.
3. There is no effect due to sex in rating debate teams.
4. There is no effect due to sex in the rankings assigned to debaters.

### Predictor variables

The method chosen for the testing of the research hypotheses was an adaptation of multivariate regression analysis, using "dummy" variables to introduce nominal data into the regression equation. Since the variable tested lay outside the range of ability, any significant apportioning of variance in the dependent measure to sex was taken as evidence of a non-ability effect.

Regression analysis was chosen as the appropriate statistical procedure because the goal of the experiment was the construction of a prediction equation for the outcome of intercollegiate debates based on sex.

Actual calculations were performed by the University of Florida Computing Center using the BMDX63 program "Multivariate General Linear Hypothesis" developed by the U.C.L.A. Health Sciences Computing Facility. The output from this program includes regression coefficients for each of the predictor variables in the model, various cross-product

matrices, and appropriate "F" statistics with associated degrees of freedom for hypotheses selected by the user.<sup>8</sup>

BMDX63 tested a regression model of the general form:<sup>9</sup>

$$\hat{Y} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + \beta_4 X_4 + \beta_5 X_5 + \beta_6 X_6 + \beta_7 X_7 + \epsilon,$$

where  $\hat{Y}$  was the estimated value of the dependent measure;

$\beta_0 \dots \beta_7$  were the weights associated with each of the eight possible combinations of sex of the debater, colleague, and judge;

$x_1 \dots x_7$  were dummy variables (interpreted as either 1 or 0) representing the various sex combinations; and  $\epsilon$  represented unexplained variance in the model.

## RESULTS

When considering win-loss as the dependent measure, there were a number of significant differences revealed by the data. Sex affected win-loss both for debaters and for judges. These results are shown in Table I.

TABLE I

### Regression Of Sex On Win-Loss For Groups

Group	F-score	d.f.	Interpretation
Male debaters	10.37	3,92	p < .01
Female debaters	10.25	4,92	p < .01
Male judges	16.13	3,92	p < .01
Female judges	5.22	4,92	p < .01

Interaction between the sex of the debaters and the sex of the judge was also examined. In all cases, the calculated regression weights were found to be significant with  $p < .05$ . These are the results shown in Table II.

TABLE II

Regression Of Sex On Win-Loss

Variable (debater/colleague/judge)	Weight	F-score
X <sub>1</sub> male/male/female	-0.54	18.47
X <sub>2</sub> male/female/male	-0.88	24.66
X <sub>3</sub> male/female/female	-0.44	6.91
X <sub>4</sub> female/male/male	-0.88	24.66
X <sub>5</sub> female/male/female	-0.44	6.91
X <sub>6</sub> female/female/male	-0.83	23.36
X <sub>7</sub> female/female/female	-0.50	8.05

When considering the effects of sex on the dependent measure speaker rating, analysis again revealed the presence of significant regression. No significant effects were found for groups in speaker rating. However, this was not the case when considering interaction among the sex of the debater, the sex of the colleague, and the sex of the judge. These results are shown in Table III.

TABLE III

## Regression of Sex on Speaker Ratings

Variable	Weight	F-score	Interpretation
$X_1$	-0.30	0.08	$p > .05$
$X_2$	-3.30	4.94	$p < .05$
$X_3$	-1.47	1.06	$p > .05$
$X_4$	-3.68	6.12	$p < .05$
$X_5$	-3.47	5.92	$p < .05$
$X_6$	0.28	0.05	$p > .05$
$X_7$	-2.30	2.40	$p > .05$

Sex affected team ratings both for debaters and by judges. Regression of sex on team ratings by groups is summarized in Table IV.

TABLE IV

## Regression Of Sex On Team Ratings For Groups

Group	F-score	d.f.	Interpretation
Male debaters	2.34	3,92	$p > .05$
Female debaters	2.67	4,92	$p < .05$
Male Judges	3.44	3,92	$p < .05$
Female Judges	1.82	4,92	$p > .05$

Once again, significant interaction was found to exist among the sex of the debater, the sex of the colleague, and the sex of the judge. The regression weights for various sex combinations and the results of the tests for significance are shown in Table V.

---

TABLE V  
Regression Of Sex On Team Ratings

Variable	Weight	F-score	Interpretation
$X_1$	-0.09	0.19	$p > .05$
$X_2$	-0.58	4.53	$p < .05$
$X_3$	-0.48	3.40	$p > .05$
$X_4$	-0.58	4.53	$p < .05$
$X_5$	-0.48	3.40	$p > .05$
$X_6$	0.13	0.32	$p > .05$
$X_7$	-0.45	2.77	$p > .05$

---

When considering the effects of sex on the dependent measure speaker ranking, analysis again revealed the presence of significant regression. The differences between groups were tested, and the results are shown in Table VI.

TABLE VI

Regression Of Sex On Speaker Rankings  
For Groups

Group	F-score	d.f.	Interpretation
Male debaters	4.09	3,92	p < .05
Female debaters	4.26	4,92	p < .01
Male judges	6.60	3,92	p < .01
Female Judges	2.19	4,92	p > .05

As was the case for the other three dependent measures, speaker ranking revealed interaction effects between the sex of the debaters and the sex of the judge. The calculated regression weights, with their associated "F" statistic and interpretations, are shown in Table VII.

TABLE VII

## Regression of Sex on Speaker Rankings

Variable	Weight	F-score	Interpretation
$x_1$	0.80	6.49	p < .05
$x_2$	1.43	10.42	p < .01
$x_3$	0.63	2.24	p > .05
$x_4$	1.43	10.42	p < .01
$x_5$	0.96	5.21	p < .05
$x_6$	1.30	11.38	p < .01
$x_7$	0.80	3.28	p > .05

## CONCLUSIONS

The rater-bound variable "sex" appears to have a significant effect on some measures of the outcome of debates. Each of the ballot measures revealed some significant regression effects.

Tests of the dependent measure win-loss challenged the conclusions of Hensley and Strother. The finding of significant differences allows for prediction of win-loss results by sex as follows.

$$\hat{y} = 1.0 - .54x_1 - .88x_2 - .44x_3 - .88x_4 \\ - .44x_5 - .83x_6 - .50x_7$$

where  $x_1$  represents a male team before a female judge;  
 $x_2, x_4$  represent mixed teams before a male judge;  
 $x_3, x_5$  represent mixed teams before a female judge;  
 $x_6$  represents a female team before a male judge; and  
 $x_7$  represents a female team before a female judge.

The presence of interaction effects invalidates any general statements as to the comparative expectations of winning among male, female, and mixed teams. If  $\hat{y} \geq .5$  is defined as an expected win, and  $\hat{y} < .5$  as an expected loss for any given debate, then these results indicate that all-male teams had a greater expectation of winning before a male than a female judge. Mixed teams and all-female teams, however, lose more frequently with male judges and may expect to win with female judges.



When considering the dependent measure speaker rating, the corrected model for predicting outcome on the basis of sex was as follows.

$$\hat{y} = 22.8 - 3.3x_2 - 3.68x_4 - 3.47x_5$$

This model indicates that the members of mixed teams received lower ratings than either all-male or all-female teams. Before a male judge, the predicted speaker rating for the male member of a mixed team was 19.5, as compared to 22.8 for a male debater with a male colleague before a male judge. The expected rating for the female member of a mixed team before a male judge was 19.12. When debating before a female judge, the female in a mixed team had an expected rating of 19.33.

The dependent measure team rating also revealed significant effects due to sex. In general, female debaters tended to be associated with lower team ratings than did male debaters. Conversely, male judges tended to give lower team ratings than female judges. The corrected model for predicting team ratings on the basis of sex was as follows.

$$\hat{y} = 3.70 - .58x,$$

where x represents mixed teams before a male judge.

The data also provided sufficient evidence to reject hypothesis #4. The corrected model for predicting speaker rank by sex was as follows.

$$\hat{y} = 1.7 + .8x_1 + 1.43x_2 + 1.43x_4 + .96x_5 + 1.3x_6$$

These findings tend to conflict with the results reported by Hayes and McAdoo. The model indicates that the members of mixed teams were ranked lower by male than by female judges. The expected rankings were 3.13 as compared to 1.70. For all-male teams, higher rankings came from male judges (1.7 as compared to 2.5 for female judges). For all-female teams, better rankings were received from female than from male judges. Hayes and McAdoo suggest the possibility of a leniency error by male judges in favor of female debaters. These results point in the opposite direction.

The presence of significant interactions between the sex of the debaters and the sex of the judge represents a serious challenge to the integrity of intercollegiate debate. Immediate research is needed to discover means of compensating for the biases revealed by this study. In the absence of such compensatory measures, debate judges can only strive individually to purge their decisions of bias.

It should be noted in conclusion that this researcher did not accept the results reported here as indicative of a difference in performance between the sexes. Such a difference, if it did exist, might well represent the source of the regression effects discussed above. An experimental design which could hold ability constant while manipulating sex as the independent variable would shed more light on the issue, and would be of great value to the field of forensics.

## FOOTNOTES

Mr. Hill (Ph.D., University of Florida, 1973), is Assistant Professor of Communication and Director of Forensics at Mississippi State University.

<sup>1</sup>Documentation of this can be found in a number of places. Nichols pointed it out in 1937, and, as late as 1952, Emery advocated it as the most desirable procedure. See Egbert R. Nichols, "A Historical Sketch of Intercollegiate Debating: III," Quarterly Journal of Speech, XXIII (April, 1937), 259-278; and Emogene Emery, "Rehabilitating Women's Debate," Southern Speech Journal, XVII (March, 1952), 186-191.

<sup>2</sup>Berry reported in 1928 that forty-four out of fifty-six schools surveyed maintained separate men's and women's teams. Mildred F. Berry, "A Survey of Intercollegiate Debate in the Mid-West Debate Conference," Quarterly Journal of Speech, XIV (February, 1928), 86-94.

<sup>3</sup>The 1973-74 A.F.A. Calendar of Tournaments reports only 12 which have a separate women's division in debate. Of these, seven are located in the Pacific Northwest. Jack Howe, (ed.), "A.F.A. Calendar 1973-74," Journal of the American Forensic Association, IX (Spring, 1973), 413-425.

<sup>4</sup>Wayne E. Hensley and David B. Strother, "Success in Debate," The Speech Teacher, XVII (September, 1968), 235-237.

<sup>5</sup>Michael T. Hayes and Joe McAdoo, "Debate Performances: Differences Between Male and Female Rankings," Journal of the American Forensic Association, VIII (Winter, 1972), 127-131.

<sup>6</sup>The years covered were the academic years 1967-68, 1968-69, 1969-70, 1970-71, and 1971-72. The tournaments involved were the Peachtree Debate Tournament, hosted by Emory University in Atlanta, Georgia; the Birmingham Invitational Debate Tournament, hosted by Samford University in Birmingham, Alabama; and the Gator Invitational Debate Tournament, hosted by the University of Florida in Gainesville, Florida.

<sup>7</sup>In order to achieve this limit, the following formula for determining the size of the test sample was used:

$$n = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^L \frac{N_i^2 \sigma_i^2}{w_i}}{N^2 \frac{B^2}{4} + \sum_{i=1}^L N_i^2 \sigma_i^2}$$

Since this formula requires some estimate of population variance for each of the sample strata, a "1 in 20" systematic sample with  $N = 200$  was drawn from the data pool to provide those estimates. For a discussion and mathematical validation of this formula, see William Mendenhall, Lyman Ott, and Richard Schaefer, Elementary Survey Sampling (Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc., 1971), p. 61.

<sup>8</sup>For a description of this program, see W. J. Dixon, BMD Biomedical Computer Programs: X-Series Supplement. (University of California Publications in Automatic Computation No. 3, 1973), pp. 23-33.

<sup>9</sup>Using the values calculated by BMDX63, various null hypotheses of regression effect were tested as follows. The general hypothesis of some effect due to sex was of the form

$$H_0: \beta_1 = \beta_2 = \dots = \beta_k = 0$$

$$H_a: \text{at least one } \beta_i \neq 0$$

In order to isolate the specific items in which an effect due to sex was to be found, each of the terms in the model was tested under the general form

$$H_0: \beta_i = 0$$

$$H_a: \beta_i \neq 0$$

All tests were made using a preset value of  $\alpha = .05$ , and the test statistic

$$F = \frac{MSR}{MSE} \quad \Omega \quad F_{1, 2}^{v_1, v_2}$$

In all cases, actual calculation of the values was performed by the University of Florida Computing Center through the use of the BMDX63 program.

## CURRENT DEBATE AND PUBLIC POLICY ANALYSIS

Michael Hall

In recent years intercollegiate debating has de-emphasized some traditional techniques of public speaking in favor of a greater stress on the presentation of research data and on policy analysis. A debate round between college teams no longer sounds like a televised debate between popular political advocates. Form and content have become too complex and sophisticated for the general public. Academic debate has become more academic.

As debate has altered its role in speech education, some university departments have developed new, less rigorous and less competitive debate activities to supplement their curricular offerings. Much of debate's former educational role within the speech communication field has been shifted to other competitive forensic activities. These activities often concentrate on the pleasing, persuasive communication of very generalized concepts and values. At the same time, embattled debate coaches are continually confronted with criticism of current debating techniques. With justification, these critics argue that debating shows an increasing lack of concern for pleasing and persuasive communication of

ideas. Despite the assurances of some debate coaches, it seems clear that contemporary debating indeed does not teach the same techniques with the same effectiveness as did traditional intercollegiate debating.

An adequate defense of current academic debating must be based on an evaluation of the techniques and activities that are now emphasized. Tournament debating today focuses on a complex, and often highly technical evaluation of alternative policy systems. Beyond the more traditional appeals to basic cultural values, current debate centers more on quantifying and qualifying the impact of the various aspects of public policy on those values. If debaters today sound less like politicians, it is because they sound more like public policy analysts. Academic debate has undergone important changes in emphasis. And these changes perhaps have made debate training an even more vital part of the educational process. The purpose of this article is to suggest some important relationships between public policy analysis and intercollegiate debating as it has evolved. In addition, the article will conclude with a discussion of the expanded educational objectives that are being met by intercollegiate debating as it is now practiced.

The concerns and activities of public policy analysts are very similar to those of current college debaters. The analysis of public policy has attracted increased attention

among social scientists and government officials in recent years. Beyond the realm of ideology and partisan politics, policy analysts seek to determine the actual outputs of government and private actions. In addition to documenting the effects of existing policy, analysts attempt to determine the most desirable future policy. These determinations arise from intensive studies using many different kinds and sources of data.

Public policy analysis draws most heavily on the disciplines of political science and economics, although the expertise from other fields is often required for the completion of projects. Political scientists contribute knowledge of American government and politics, public administration, law, and normative political values. Economists offer insight into public and private finance, economic development, and resource allocation.

Traditional academic debate was often thought of as the training ground for students who might enter politics. Correspondingly, the techniques emphasized in traditional debate were those considered most useful to the public speaker who was involved in partisan political advocacy. Changes in academic debate, however, have made it less akin to political advocacy designed for the general public. Current academic debate emphasizes a framework for analysis more similar to the activities of the professional policy analyst. Undergraduate debaters

rely on research in the same fields of knowledge as do professional analysts. In examining policy options, many considerations must be weighed before an optimum course or courses of action can be recommended. Both debaters and policy analysts have a strong interest in the features of politics and government in the United States. Any policy system will be integrated into the larger political system. The outputs of a single policy will be greatly affected by its environment.

To be sure, analysts must be more sensitive to political considerations in recommending policy alternatives to political and bureaucratic leaders than debaters need be in arguing their cases before debate judges. Clearly many affirmative cases would not win the approval of the electorate. Nevertheless, debaters must still be cognizant of the political barriers to the adoption of the affirmative proposal. For example, affirmative solvency often depends on an understanding of the political forces that the affirmative fiat circumvents. Unlike the would-be-technocratic role of the debater, policy analysts in universities, institutes, consulting firms, and bureaucracies cannot assume implementation of their recommendations. Still, policy analysts have a distinctively different outlook than officials who establish and carry out policies. Even though analysts take into account some political considerations, the nature of their role is to retain a more "objective,"



less-compromised viewpoint about policy. In this respect, then, analysts share an important common ground with debaters.

Analysts and debaters also share a common concern for implementation problems that may occur in the administration of programs. Debaters usually show the greatest concern over agencies that have been "captured" by interest groups. Policy analysts are often more concerned with the rigidity of programs or the lack of central control over the implementation of programs. Both groups are quick to research any hint of deficiencies in manpower, facilities, training, or funding. Both are interested in administrative regulations that hamper program effectiveness.

The legal framework is of great interest to debaters who must provide a "structural change" in the system by the affirmative plan. Even when the indicted structure is not a law, debaters often must alter associated laws or regulations to effect the change. Policy analysts similarly are many times concerned with legislative changes in programs they review.

Unlike debaters, policy analysts look carefully at the level of current funding in evaluating a program. Laws appropriating funds for programs are a major consideration for decision makers who must balance the benefits of programs that compete for limited revenues. On the other hand, debaters most often face a choice between a program and no program. Thus, while the cost issue is rarely decisive in a debate, it is often a

a primary concern for policy-makers and policy analysts.

Implicit in the study of public policy is the cultural values of the society that the policy is to serve. Analysts must weigh the relative good of a policy's various outputs. Undesirable side effects must also enter into any decision. Debaters must defend a system of normative values when they appeal to the judge to vote for the "better" policy system. Affirmative cases with a philosophical justification make a normative social or political value the central consideration in the contest. Cases without an overt philosophical justification assume an implicit value system as a framework for debate. In the case of both analysts and debaters, much consideration of society's values goes into the final product of their efforts.

In summary, the professional policy analyst, in dealing with public policy systems and alternatives, is joined by experts from other fields. Traditional areas in the discipline of political science provide data and basic concepts. Economics is also a basic resource discipline for the analyst. Depending on the type of policy question being considered, other social scientists, historians, and natural scientists may contribute. Debaters look to this same interdisciplinary group in researching policy questions. Moreover, both policy analysts and debaters synthesize the findings of many disciplines in pursuing their crafts. Thus, in many

important ways, current debate operates much like professional policy analysis, and provides students with training in the same kinds of research, data selection, synthesis, and reporting techniques.

The techniques that are being learned in contemporary academic debating have much worth to students from many disciplines. Clearly future public policy analysts would profit from a background in current intercollegiate debating. And while future political advocates may find that techniques of argumentation learned on the current college debate team are less useful on the hustings than techniques of more traditional debate might have been, they may also find that once they achieve positions of influence they will now have the tools to better understand and evaluate professional policy recommendations that come to their desks. Political science students concerned with American politics and government, public administration, and normative political theory also stand to gain by the intense training now provided in academic debate. Moreover, current debating techniques have not diminished the traditional appeal of forensic training for students who plan careers in law. Quite the contrary, the expansion of government and accompanying legislation into so many new areas of public affairs has placed an even greater emphasis on the need for the student of law to be able to deal with all manners of public policy considerations.

A long-standing tradition of undergraduate forensic programs has been the strong support they provide to other academic disciplines within the university. Participation in debate has often been a springboard for additional student interest and effort in non-speech subject areas. The new practices in current debating are not alien to this tradition. Current debate participants must read widely from the literature of many disciplines in preparation for competition. The constant need to synthesize arguments forces debate participants to relate knowledge from one subject area to another. Thus, today's forensics remains a truly interdisciplinary educational experience.

While debating continues to benefit students in many of the traditional ways, the changes that have evolved in the nature of the activity place greater emphasis on developing students' abilities to engage in intensive research, careful analysis, and sophisticated synthesis. This kind of training may well make debate more valuable to more students than ever before. No other kind of activity in higher education provides students with the intensified and continued learning experience as does academic debate as it is now practiced. Today's college debaters profit from the following educational benefits of forensic training:

1. Students are introduced to a major public policy area each academic year. They become aware of important issues that face the nation. And they become

well-informed about the policy area, and often remain interested in the subjects debated years after leaving their undergraduate forensic programs.

2. Debaters learn to research effectively. The research demands of current academic debating are insatiable. Learning the techniques of efficient library research is a valuable lesson for school and for later life. For students who go on to graduate and professional schools, these skills may be more important than the specific knowledge gained.
3. Current debating requires careful synthesis of arguments prior to competition. The need to respond effectively to a great variety of approaches to resolutions requires the student to develop skills to relate concepts and data from many diverse fields, and to use the information in a clearly organized manner employing sophisticated analysis.
4. Even with relentless research efforts and careful "blocking" of arguments, current debating guarantees that negative teams will inevitably be faced with some cases which they have not anticipated. This means that debaters, while operating in a highly competitive and intellectually-demanding confrontation situation, must think quickly and respond effectively to interpretations of resolutions and accompanying specific arguments that they had not considered in their preparation. This kind of valuable learning experience was rarely provided in traditional debating. And today no other activity in higher education provides students with similar training and experiences.
5. Even with the alleged "non-persuasive" aspects of current debating, participants must evaluate the relative importance of the large numbers of arguments in constructive speeches and then synthesize a winning position to present to the critic-judge in rebuttals. This is a demanding and useful exercise in critical thinking and involves on a more intense level the same kinds of analyses that have always been a part of effective advocacy.

Current debating can be evaluated fairly only by judging the usefulness to students of the techniques that are now taught. With the present emphasis on policy alternative comparisons, debate now offers the student broad knowledge

in a particular significant problem area, intensive training in research methods, training in complex policy analysis, opportunities to develop the ability to respond quickly and effectively to unfamiliar arguments and ideas, and experiences in efficiently synthesizing voting issues from numerous constructive positions. These skills are important to students who will attend graduate and professional schools, and later move into occupations in the policy-making or the policy-evaluating process; or to perhaps a greater number of students who simply wish to become well-informed citizens capable of dealing with complex problems and making intelligent contributions to self-government. It seems true that some useful public speaking techniques have been sacrificed in the changing nature of academic debate, but the techniques of public policy analysis continue to make debate one of the most important educational experiences available to undergraduate students.

---

Michael Hall is a political science graduate student at Vanderbilt University. He received his undergraduate degree from Middle Tennessee State University where he was a participant in the debating program.

## 1975 TENNESSEE SPEAKER OF THE YEAR

Each year the Tennessee Speech Communication Association recognizes excellence in public speaking through the selection of the organization's choice of an outstanding speaker. This year Mr. James Neal of Nashville has been named 1975 Speaker of the Year.

Mr. Neal received his undergraduate degree from the University of Wyoming in 1951. After serving as a captain in the United States Marine Corps from 1951 to 1954, he entered the Vanderbilt School of Law. In 1957 Mr. Neal received the LLB degree and graduated first in his class. In 1960 he earned the LLM degree from Georgetown School of Law, Georgetown University, Washington, DC.

Mr. Neal maintained a private law practice in Washington until 1961 when he became special assistant to the Attorney General of the United States. In 1964 he was appointed United States District Attorney for the middle district of Tennessee. In 1966 Mr. Neal began a private law practice in Nashville. In 1973 he was appointed Associate Special Prosecutor on the Watergate Special Prosecution Force. Mr. Neal has now returned to private practice in Nashville.

At the fall workshop convention of the Tennessee Speech Communication Association, Mr. Neal was given the organization's award for his outstanding communication efforts in his profession.

MINUTES OF THE TSCA EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

September 27, 1975

Vanderbilt University

Present: Dean, Walker, Baker, Brooks, Hillman, Yeomans,  
Schneider, Kovalcheck, Woodland, Mashburn.

Absent: Finton, Frank, Julian, Conner.

The meeting was called to order by President Richard Dean. David Walker served as secretary in the absence of Jay Conner.

Minutes of the previous meeting were accepted. The treasurer's report was read and accepted.

Hillman/Brooks moved that the association pay for lunch for the honorees at the TSCA workshop today. PASSED.

Hillman/Brooks moved that renewal/expiration dates for TSCA memberships be based on the academic year. All memberships will expire in August. The Executive Secretary is instructed to mail out reminders to members in August. There should still be a membership drive in winter. PASSED.

Kovalcheck/Baker moved that \$1 be charged for admission to the convention for high school and college students. PASSED.

President Dean presented for approval his appointments to two committee chairmanships. They were: Bob Woodland to the Committee on Awards, and Bud Frank to the Committee on Professional Ethics and Educational Standards. Both were approved by the Executive Committee.

The next executive committee meeting will be held in conjunction with the tournament of the Tennessee Inter-collegiate Forensics Association in February in Murfreesboro.

The executive committee elected the following to serve as this year's nominating committee: Randy Fisher, David Walker, Valerie Schneider, Harold Baker, and Jim Brooks. The Executive Secretary was instructed to send these committee members an up to date membership list.



Al Yeomans also requested that an up to date membership list be mailed to him for use in the membership drive of SSCA.

The meeting adjourned at 9 a.m.

Respectively submitted,

David Walker  
Past President

## SPEECH COMMUNICATION ACTIVITIES ACROSS THE STATE

CARSON-NEWMAN COLLEGE -- Forensics participants under the direction of Professor Dick Finton are attending fifteen tournaments this year to compete in debate and individual event contests. In addition the forensics program will sponsor the annual Smoky Mountain High School Forensics Tournament on February 20-22. . . . New departmental courses to be offered this year are Forensics, Parliamentary Procedure, Speech Education, American Oratory, and Advanced Public Speaking. . . . Under the direction of Professor John Lee Welton, the drama program presented MEDEA as the major fall production. In addition to this major production, numerous one-act plays were produced. . . . Speech professor Danny Champion recently completed his doctoral course work at LSU. . . . Professor Finton is a summer staff member of the University of Nebraska at Omaha College Debate Workshop; he also serves as Carson-Newman's tennis coach.

CHEATHAM COUNTY HIGH SCHOOL -- Under the direction of speech and drama teacher Joyce Mayo, five plays will be presented this year. Three of those will be THE UGLY DUCKLING, UP THE DOWN STAIRCASE, and OUR TOWN. . . . Participants in forensics will attend two tournaments during the year. . . . The school Thespians organization plans a week-end trip to the University of Tennessee at Knoxville to see MACBETH and a trip to Ball State University in Indiana to attend a national drama conference.

CLEVELAND DAY SCHOOL -- Mrs. Elizabeth J. Hayba, Cleveland Day School's speech and drama teacher, directs a play each spring that serves the community as a dinner theater program.

EAST TENNESSEE STATE UNIVERSITY -- Professor Robert O. Day continues to host and direct an annual thirty-part television series on Elementary Oral Language Arts which is broadcast twice each week over Tennessee Educational Television via WSJK-TV. . . . This fall the Interpreters Theater under the direction of Professor Day presented IF I WERE ONLY A CHILD AGAIN OR MOTHER GOOSE LAYS AN EGG. The spring program for the Interpreters Theater includes an extensive program of productions for children which will be toured to regional elementary schools. . . . The university theater program has developed a complete "American Bicentennial Theater Season" featuring four major productions. The fall production was ARK OF SAFETY by H. Richardson and F. Goforth, a world premiere marking the opening of the newly renovated Gilbreath Theater. The director was Professor Harold Frank. Coming up in the new year are AH, WILDERNESS to be directed by Jack Peyrouse, INDIANS (THE STORY OF BUFFALO BILL) to be directed by Professor Daryl Frank,

and DAVY CROCKETT to be directed by Professor Peyrouse. . . . Speech professor William M. Moorhouse recently published an article in VIRGINIA CAVALCADE entitled "Alexander Campbell: The Virginia Constitutional Convention - 1830-1831." . . . Speech professor Valerie Schneider is serving as an associate editor of a new publication entitled HOMILETIC. The journal presents reviews of resource materials of interest to preachers and seminary personnel. It is sponsored jointly by the Religious Speech Communication Association, American Academy of Homiletics, and the Episcopal College of Preachers. Dr. Schneider also has four book reviews in the first edition of the journal which became available in October.

FAIRVIEW HIGH SCHOOL -- Speech and drama courses and activities are provided by Mr. Richard Huckaba. Two courses are offered that provide instruction in public speaking, improvisational theater, and basic dramatics. Students will attend several tournaments with competition in extemp, poetry interpretation, prose interpretation, declamation, and original oratory.

FRANKLIN COUNTY HIGH SCHOOL -- The Senior Drama Club will again be sponsored by Mrs. Lowell Bennett and Mrs. Sadie Chandler. Plans are underway for a major spring production. . . . Mrs. Thelma F. Lambert is in the process of reorganizing the Debate Club for participation in the Bicentennial Youth Debates Program.

FRAYSER HIGH SCHOOL -- Under the direction of speech and drama teacher Paulyene L. Palmer, Frayser High's Thirteenth Annual Leon M. Stevenson Forensic Invitational Tournament was hosted in November. Ms. Palmer, who received her masters degree last August from Memphis State University, teaches all the speech courses which provide instruction in basic speech, debate, and drama. She also directs the forensics, debate, and drama activities.

GILES COUNTY HIGH SCHOOL -- Mrs. Phyllis Hannah teaches the public speaking courses at Giles County High. The Dramatic Club is sponsored by Mrs. Mary Abernathy.

LAUSANNE SCHOOL -- Speech and drama instruction is provided by Mrs. Edythe D. Tessen. One course of two semesters is offered and includes phonetics, public speaking, parliamentary procedure, and dramatic interpretation. Students also present original short plays.

LYNN VIEW HIGH SCHOOL -- The one-year old Drama Club, directed by Ruth Street, has already grown to 110 members with plans to produce two one-act plays and one major production for the 75-76 season. Students will also compete in East Tennessee State University's Speech and Drama tournament.

MARTIN COLLEGE -- A unique part of the theater program at Martin College this year is the production of a one-act dramatic meditation entitled CRY DAWN IN DARK BABYLON. The production is being toured to religious institutions. . . . One course, Fundamentals of Speech, is offered to all undergraduate students at Martin.

MIDDLE TENNESSEE STATE UNIVERSITY -- Under the direction of Jim Brooks and Jay Conner, MTSU Forensics is hosting three college tournaments this year including the 9th Annual MTSU Earlybird Varsity Invitational Debate Tournament, the 19th Annual MTSU Jr. Debate Tournament, and the state tournament of the Tennessee Intercollegiate Forensics Association. The forensics program also offers monthly public campus forums, which included in November a debate between MTSU debaters and debaters from Oxford University, England. The Oxford team defended the resolution that the Declaration of Independence was an unwarranted act of rebellion. In addition to the above activities, student participants will attend approximately twenty-four intercollegiate tournaments throughout the year. . . . Under the direction of Dorethe Tucker, the University Theater is presenting four major productions for the year. This fall's productions were THE BOY FRIEND and VERONICA'S ROOM. In addition to these major productions, student members of the Buchanan Players, the drama club, participate in weekly productions and workshops. . . . Professor Ralph Hillman directed an interpersonal communication workshop at the fall TSCA meeting. . . . "Studies in American Speech Communication," a course available for undergraduate and graduate credit and taught by Professor David Walker, will be offered during the spring intersession, May 10-28.

UNIVERSITY OF THE SOUTH -- Major productions for the year are WHO'S AFRAID OF VIRGINIA WOOLF?, THE BARBER OF VERSAILLES (written by the University of the South's public relations director Edith Whitesell), FATHER UXBRIDGE WANTS TO MARRY, and RICHARD II. The theater program is directed by Professor Robert H. Wilcox. Play direction students also produce numerous one-act plays.

SOUTHERN MISSIONARY COLLEGE -- Don Dick, Communication Department chairman, is on leave this year and is the producer of the FAITH FOR TODAY Westbrook Hospital dramatic television series produced in California. Serving as interim chairman is Professor James Hannum. . . . Ole Kristensen, a specialist in nonverbal communication, is new in the speech area of the department. . . . France Andrews has joined the communication staff to coordinate the journalism area. The Communications Department operates WSMC-FM with six full-time and twenty part-time staff members. Broadcast and film instruction has just moved into a new production lab facility designed for teaching. . . . Six junior and senior

communication media emphasis majors are enrolled in "Special Projects in Communication" and are producing a multimedia extravaganza involving a number of slide projectors, 16 mm, dissolve units, computer control, quad sound, and so forth. A week of showings in December in Collegedate is now being followed by a road tour of the production. The show is entitled "Experience" and features hang gliding, shots at Six Flags Over Georgia, and film of Road Atlanta with an entire sequence using people only on the track as race cars (similar to the Gulf Oil commercials).

WEBB SCHOOL -- For the first time in ten years debate activities are being organized at Webb School. In charge of reviving debate are Mrs. Lynn Holliman, Mrs. Sandra Truitt, and a new faculty member, Mr. William Rice. . . . The dramatics organization of about twenty-five students will produce two plays this season, one directed by the faculty sponsor, Mr. William Rice, and the other directed by an elected student.

TENNESSEE TEMPLE COLLEGE

Chattanooga, Tennessee

With BA and BS Degrees in Speech

With MS Degree in Education with a Graduate  
Minor in Speech

Offering Courses in:

Broadcasting  
Dramatic Productions  
Oral Interpretation  
Rhetoric and Public Address  
Speech Education

For More Information Write:

Chairman, Speech and Drama Department  
Tennessee Temple College  
Chattanooga, Tennessee 37404

---

MIDDLE TENNESSEE STATE UNIVERSITY

SPEECH AND THEATRE DEPARTMENT

Area Majors

speech communication  
theatre  
speech and hearing therapy

Co-Curricular Program

mtsu forensics  
university theatre  
speech and hearing clinic

For information write:

Dr. Larry V. Lowe, Chairman  
Speech and Theatre Department  
MTSU  
Murfreesboro, Tennessee 37130

## PUBLICATION INFORMATION

THE JOURNAL OF THE TENNESSEE SPEECH COMMUNICATION ASSOCIATION is published twice yearly in the Fall and Spring. Subscriptions and requests for advertising rates should be addressed to Jim Brooks, Box 309-MTSU, Murfreesboro, TN, 37132. Regular subscription price for non-members, beginning with the Spring, 1976, issue, is \$4.00 yearly, or \$2.00 per issue. The TSCA Journal is printed by the MTSU Print Shop, Middle Tennessee State University, Murfreesboro, TN, 37132. Second class postage is paid at Middle Tennessee State University, Murfreesboro, TN.

The purpose of the publication is to expand professional interest and activity in all areas of the field of speech communication in Tennessee. Articles from all areas of speech study will be welcomed, with special consideration given to articles treating pedagogical concepts, techniques, and experiments.

All papers should be sent to the editor. Authors should submit two copies of their manuscripts, each under a separate title page also to include the author's name and address. Manuscripts without the identifying title pages will be forwarded by the editor to a panel of reader-referees who will represent the varied interests within the discipline.

All papers should be double-spaced, typed in standard type with a dark ribbon, paginated in pencil, and on standard typing paper. Margins should be standard and uniform. Footnotes should be typed single-spaced on separate sheets following the last page of the manuscript proper. The first footnote will be eliminated by the editor from the manuscripts sent to the panel of readers. Any professional style guide, consistently used, is acceptable.

Accuracy, originality, and proper citing of source materials are the responsibilities of the contributors. Articles from ten to twenty pages will fit best into the format of the journal.

Institutions and individuals wishing to be patrons of the journal may do so with a contribution of \$25.00 yearly.