

THE INSTRUCTIONAL METHODS AND  
MATERIALS USED IN TEACHING REASONING  
AND EVIDENCE TO HIGH SCHOOL DEBATERS

Thesis for the Degree of M. A.  
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY  
John F. Kirn  
1961



2 250

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

## ABSTRACT

### THE INSTRUCTIONAL METHODS AND MATERIALS USED IN TEACHING REASONING AND EVIDENCE TO HIGH SCHOOL DEBATERS

by John F. Kirn

The purpose of this study was to affirm or deny certain hypotheses which the writer developed as a result of his experience in teaching high school debate. The hypotheses were as follows: (1) There are particular textbooks used generally by experienced coaches. (2) Debate handbooks are used frequently as a teaching material. (3) Clinics and debate tournaments are major sources in teaching reasoning and evidence. (4) There are some unique methods and materials being used of which many coaches are unaware. (5) Experienced debaters are a prime factor in teaching reasoning and evidence. (6) The teaching of reasoning and evidence consumes more time than the teaching of other phases of debate. (7) A distinct pattern of the classifications of reasoning and evidence as taught by experienced debate coaches should be revealed by this study.





The survey was conducted in two parts. A questionnaire based on the aforementioned hypotheses was sent to 78 Michigan high school debate coaches who had taught debate at least for a consecutive three-year period. Part I asked the coaches to check methods and materials corresponding to classifications of reasoning and evidence that were used in their teaching. Part II asked the coaches to explain the methods and materials used in instruction. In addition, several questions were asked relevant to the coaches' responsibilities in an effort to establish a correlation between the methods and materials used in teaching reasoning and evidence.

Replies to the questionnaire, based on 40 respondents to Part I and 43 to Part II, were compiled, categorized, and analyzed and comprise the basis for the body of the thesis.

The thesis embodies five chapters: Chapter I outlines the Michigan High School Forensic Program in addition to introducing the study. Chapter II discusses the procedure used in conducting the survey. Chapter III tabulates and analyzes Part I of the survey, and Chapter IV tabulates and analyzes Part II. Chapter V presents a summary and conclusions.

Conclusions to the hypotheses based on the 43 replies are (1) that there are no particular textbooks used generally by experienced debate coaches, (2) that debate

handbooks are frequently used in teaching reasoning and evidence, (3) that the debate clinics and tournaments are major sources in teaching reasoning and evidence, (4) that there are some unique methods and materials used in teaching reasoning and evidence, (5) that experienced debaters are a prime factor in teaching reasoning and evidence, (6) that first of all, the amount of time teaching reasoning and evidence cannot be affirmed or denied and secondly, the amount of time varies according to individual cases, and (7) that there is no distinct pattern revealed of the classifications of reasoning and evidence as taught by experienced debate coaches.

Other findings revealed by the study were (1) that Teacher's Lecture and Teacher's Demonstration are the two most-frequently-used methods, (2) that Debate Handbooks and Practice Tournaments are the two most-frequently-used materials, (3) that analogy is the most-frequently-taught classification of reasoning, and (4) that statistics is the most-frequently-taught classification of evidence. Analogy and statistics, classifications of reasoning and evidence respectively, were taught by approximately 90 per cent of the coaches surveyed. In addition, the forms of causal reasoning were revealed to be used more often by the respondents than were the forms of syllogistic reasoning.

The study suggests that high school debate in

Michigan is a poorly planned activity, existing under numerous obstacles. It is with this in mind that the writer concluded by suggesting several areas for further study relevant to upgrading the Michigan debate program.

THE INSTRUCTIONAL METHODS AND MATERIALS USED  
IN TEACHING REASONING AND EVIDENCE  
TO HIGH SCHOOL DEBATORS

By

John F. Kirn

A THESIS

Submitted to  
Michigan State University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Speech

1961

APPROVED: David C Ralph

G 15144  
1000

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer is sincerely appreciative of the assistance through guidance and encouragement given by the director of this study, Dr. David Ralph. The writer also wishes to acknowledge and thank Dr. Frederick Alexander and Dr. Donald Ecroyd for their instruction and criticism. And to my wife, Alice, who encouraged, criticized, and worked valiantly in typing the drafts, I can only say, thank you from the depths of my heart.



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS . . . . .	ii
LIST OF TABLES. . . . .	v
LIST OF APPENDIXES. . . . .	vii
 Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION. . . . .	1
Philosophy of Forensics . . . . .	1
Statement of the Problem. . . . .	6
Significance of the Study . . . . .	7
Justification . . . . .	12
Plan of the Study . . . . .	13
Definitions . . . . .	14
Organization. . . . .	15
II. PROCEDURE OF THE SURVEY . . . . .	16
III. TABULATION AND ANALYSIS OF PART I . . . . .	21
Rankings of the Classifications of Reasoning and Evidence . . . . .	24
Methods Used in Teaching the Classifications of Reasoning. . . . .	27
Materials Used in Teaching the Classifications of Reasoning . . . . .	34
Methods Used in Teaching the Classifications of Evidence . . . . .	41
Materials Used in Teaching the Classifications of Evidence. . . . .	47
Summary of Methods Used in Teaching Reasoning .	53
Summary of Materials Used in Teaching Reasoning	55
Summary of Methods Used in Teaching Evidence. .	56
Summary of Materials Used in Teaching Evidence.	57
IV. TABULATION AND ANALYSIS OF PART II. . . . .	58
Debate Handbooks Review . . . . .	66
Summary . . . . .	76
V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS . . . . .	81

Discussion of Stated Hypotheses . . . . .	81
Additional Findings of the Survey . . . . .	85
Questions Developed from the Survey . . . . .	88
Speculations and Implications . . . . .	90
Areas for Further Study . . . . .	93
BIBLIOGRAPHY. . . . .	95
APPENDIX. . . . .	98



## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Ranking the Classifications of Reasoning . . . .	25
2. Ranking the Classifications of Evidence. . . . .	26
Tables of Methods Used in Teaching the Classifications of Reasoning	
3. Analogy. . . . .	27
4. Cause to Effect. . . . .	28
5. Example. . . . .	29
6. Effect to Cause. . . . .	29
7. Generalization . . . . .	30
8. Effect to Effect . . . . .	31
9. Categorical Syllogism. . . . .	31
10. Hypothetical Syllogism . . . . .	32
11. Disjunctive Syllogism. . . . .	33
12. Enthymeme. . . . .	33
13. Sign Reasoning . . . . .	34
Tables of Materials Used in Teaching the Classifications of Reasoning	
14. Analogy. . . . .	35
15. Cause to Effect. . . . .	35
16. Example. . . . .	36
17. Effect to Cause. . . . .	36
18. Generalization . . . . .	37
19. Effect to Effect . . . . .	37
20. Categorical Syllogism. . . . .	38

Table	Page
21. Hypothetical Syllogism . . . . .	39
22. Disjunctive Syllogism. . . . .	39
23. Enthymeme. . . . .	40
24. Sign Reasoning . . . . .	41
Tables of Methods Used in Teaching the Classifications of Evidence	
25. Statistics . . . . .	42
26. Example. . . . .	42
27. Authority. . . . .	43
28. Opinions . . . . .	44
29. Primary or Original Sources. . . . .	44
30. Literal and Figurative Analogies . . . . .	45
31. Secondary Sources. . . . .	46
32. Circumstantial . . . . .	46
Tables of Materials Used in Teaching the Classifications of Evidence	
33. Statistics . . . . .	47
34. Example. . . . .	48
35. Authority. . . . .	49
36. Opinions . . . . .	49
37. Primary or Original Sources. . . . .	50
38. Literal and Figurative Analogies . . . . .	51
39. Secondary Sources. . . . .	51
40. Circumstantial . . . . .	52
Other tables	
41. Library of Textbooks . . . . .	62
42. Handbooks. . . . .	65





## LIST OF APPENDIXES

Appendix	Page
A. Personal Letter and Instructions, the Endorsements, and Part I of the Questionnaire.	98
B. Personal Letter and Instructions, the Endorsements, and Part II of the Questionnaire. . . . .	103
C. Debate Textbooks which the Coaches of this Study Used in Instructing their Debaters . .	110
D. Motion Pictures which Are Helpful in Preparing Debaters. . . . .	111

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

#### Philosophy of Forensics

A successful high school forensic program usually revolves around the school administration and the speech teacher. Assuming that the school administration is in favor of, and supports, forensic activities, the program can become, with the teacher's direction, a vital force in the lives of students.

The forensic program plays an important role by presenting opportunities for additional experiences to high school students in the speech program. According to Dr. Douglas Ehninger, writing in The Speech Teacher, a worthwhile forensics program has the following earmarks:

1. A sound forensic program is integrated with curricular instruction in public speaking and the fundamentals of speech. It should not be "extracurricular" but "co-curricular."
2. A sound forensic program is student centered. The program should exist for the benefit of the participants, not for the director's reputation or for . . . the prestige of the school.
3. In a sound forensic program participation is regulated by educationally defensible

principles: a. Participation should be spread among many students. b. Training in debate and discussion, while admittedly valuable, must in no way be allowed to interfere with the student's general academic achievement. Certainly it does not justify either excessive absences or a low quality of class work. c. . . . as an educator, the coach's concern is to build competent and well-rounded men and women, not to train a troop of highly specialized performers.

4. A sound forensic program teaches social responsibility. This should include speaking only after mature reflection, having a healthy respect for facts, and striving constantly for the public good rather than selfish ends.

5. A sound forensic program is progressive. The program is carefully planned in advance so as to provide a balance and fruitful sequence of experiences.

6. A sound forensic program is respected in the school, the community, and the region of the country in which it is carried on.<sup>1</sup>

The forensic program in Michigan is organized on a state level through the Michigan High School Forensic Association. This organization is governed by a state manager and a state forensic council consisting of two representatives from each of the following organizations: the Michigan Association of School Administrations, the Michigan Secondary School Association, the Michigan Speech Association, and the Michigan High School Forensic Association.

The forensic program is divided into two phases.

---

<sup>1</sup>Douglas Ehninger, "Six Earmarks of a Sound Forensic Program," The Speech Teacher, I (September, 1952), pp. 237-41.

The first phase is devoted to discussion and debate. League competition in this area generally lasts throughout the first semester of the school year. The state discussion program calls for two meets which are usually held the latter part of October and the first part of November. The meets include participants from three to five schools, the schools being determined by the state manager. A school is not required to participate in discussion in order to qualify for the debate program.

The debate program is so organized that a school can be a member of a local league as well as a participant in the state schedule. The number of debates in which a school competes within the local league is left to the discretion of the league members. In the state schedule a school competes against four other schools of similar student enrollment. This schedule is worked out by the state manager according to A and B divisions, A including a pupil enrollment of more than 499 and B including a pupil enrollment of less than 500.

All schools, regardless of wins and losses, have the opportunity to be represented in the state eliminations which are held separately in the A and B divisions. All schools compete in district tournaments, winners of which compete in a series of eliminations until one school is considered champion in each division.

The second phase of the forensic program is

devoted to Spring Forensics. The Upper Peninsula competes in declamation, oratory, dramatic monologue, dramatic dialogue, humorous reading, narrative reading, extempore speaking, lyric poetry reading, and radio news commentary. Pupils in the Lower Peninsula compete in declamation, interpretative reading, humorous reading, oratory, and extempore speaking. The district organization for competition is handled by the state manager. Each school selects a maximum of two students per category for district competition. The two district winners in each category participate in the regional contest. Regional competition is the highest-ranking participation in which any forensic student can compete. Awards are presented to each student taking a first or second in the district and the regional tournaments.

Having given an over-all view of the general forensic program, the writer wishes to outline the one specific area of forensics which is the major concern of this thesis: debate. J. Walter Reeves suggests what should be contained in a debate course:

- I. Proposition for Argumentation and Debate
- II. Means of Getting Material
- III. Means of Analyzing the Proposition
- IV. Brief Making
- V. Evidence
- VI. Reasoning
- VII. Means of Refutation

## VIII. The Nature of Persuasion

## IX. Style

X. Delivery<sup>2</sup>

Other authorities writing in this field generally agree with Reeves. For instance, Karl F. Robinson and John W. Keltner present a very detailed course of study that includes these major units.<sup>3</sup> In the book How to Debate the authors definitely stress these areas.<sup>4</sup> Although public speaking books on the secondary level do not stress debate as much as public speaking, one finds that the chapter on debate does include these topics in the preparation of a debate. Examples of such public speaking books are The New Better Speech,<sup>5</sup> American Speech,<sup>6</sup> and The Art of Speaking.<sup>7</sup> Debate textbooks also cover these units. Some representative works are Argumentation and Debate edited by

---

<sup>2</sup>J. Walter Reeves, "A Secondary Course in Argumentation," Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, XXXVI (May, 1952), p. 58.

<sup>3</sup>Karl F. Robinson and John W. Keltner, "Suggested Units in Discussion and Debate for Secondary Schools," Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, XXXVI (May, 1952), pp. 72-78.

<sup>4</sup>Harrison B. Summers, Forest L. Whan, and T. A. Rousse, How to Debate (New York: H. W. Wilson Co., 1953), passim.

<sup>5</sup>Andrew T. Weaver, Gladys L. Borchers, and Charles H. Woolbert, The New Better Speech (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1941), pp. 339-62.

<sup>6</sup>Wilhelmina Hedde and William Brigance, American Speech (Chicago: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1955), pp. 230-69.

<sup>7</sup>E. F. Elson and Alberta Peck, The Art of Speaking (New York: Ginn and Co., 1952), pp. 363-97.



David Potter,<sup>8</sup> Argumentation, Discussion, and Debate by A. Craig Baird,<sup>9</sup> and Argumentation and Debate by Lionel Crocker.<sup>10</sup> Thus, a general conclusion may be drawn that debate should include those units as suggested by J. Walter Reeves.

### Statement of the Problem

From the ten units suggested by Reeves, one could list numerous studies which should be conducted in order to improve the effectiveness of teaching debate to high school students. The writer has elected to limit his study to instructional methods and materials used in teaching reasoning and evidence. There are several reasons for doing this. In the first place, the subject is of primary interest to the writer. Secondly, reasoning and evidence provide the foundation for thought and, thus, are pertinent to debating. Thirdly, the writer feels, from his experience in the field of debate, that reasoning and evidence are

---

<sup>8</sup>David Potter (ed.), Argumentation and Debate (New York: The Dryden Press, 1954), passim.

<sup>9</sup>A. Craig Baird, Argumentation, Discussion, and Debate (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1950), passim.

<sup>10</sup>Lionel Crocker, Argumentation and Debate (New York: American Book Co., 1944), passim.

the least-effectively developed and taught of all phases of debate.

The purpose of this study is to affirm or deny certain hypotheses that the writer formulated from his experience in debate. It is hoped that the respondent's answers will stimulate improvement in the teaching of reasoning and evidence. The hypotheses are:

1. There are particular textbooks used generally by the experienced debate coaches.
2. Debate handbooks are used frequently as a teaching material.
3. Clinics and debate tournaments are major sources in teaching reasoning and evidence.
4. There are some unique methods and materials being used of which many coaches are unaware.
5. Experienced debaters are a prime factor in teaching reasoning and evidence.
6. The teaching of reasoning and evidence consumes more time than the teaching of other phases of debate.
7. A distinct pattern of the classifications of reasoning and evidence as taught by experienced debate coaches should be revealed by this study.

### Significance of the Study

Although there have been many studies conducted and numerous articles written disclosing the strengths and

weaknesses of the debate program, the writer has been unable to locate a study concerning the instructional methods and materials used in teaching reasoning and evidence. However, because of their significance and relationship, several studies and articles are referred to in the following paragraphs.

The Speech Association of America has sponsored the writing of several articles in an attempt to provide helpful material for the improvement of debate instruction. One of these articles, "Practical Procedures in Coaching High School Debate," stresses the use of round table discussions and practice debates as two methods of helping debaters learn reasoning and evidence.<sup>11</sup> The author, however, does not deal with particulars concerning the classifications of reasoning and evidence nor the techniques used in the teaching thereof.

Another study compiled by Robinson and Keltner involves a detailed outline for a general discussion-debate unit.<sup>12</sup> The outline does not, however, explain what classifications of reasoning and evidence should be taught.

Lillian G. Polk completed a study of the Louisiana debate program in 1939. The purpose of her study was

---

<sup>11</sup>Carney C. Smith, "Practical Procedures in Coaching High School Debaters," Quarterly Journal of Speech, XXIV (1943), pp. 222-34.

<sup>12</sup>Robinson and Keltner, op. cit., passim.

to make specific recommendations for improvements in the high school debate program. The study was conducted through three means: 19 personal letters to departments of speech, the state high school debating associations, and the debating societies; the study of 39 states' debate constitutions; and personal interviews with officers of the National Forensic League and directors of recognized debate programs. The study revealed that in order for Louisiana to improve its debate program, the following recommendations would have to be adopted:

1. Debate should be a part of the high school official course.
2. The need for trained debate directors is essential.
3. Coaches should be financially rewarded.
4. Colleges should sponsor clinics and tournaments.
5. Competent judges are needed.
6. Boys and girls should debate in one division.
7. A division between small and large schools would increase interest.<sup>13</sup>

James W. Parkerson's Master's thesis dealt with the analysis of eight representative works of argumentation, debate, and discussion in order to evaluate the principles

---

<sup>13</sup>Lillian G. Polk, "A Debating Program for Louisiana High Schools, Based on Current Debating League Practices" (unpublished Master's thesis, Agricultural and Mechanical College, Louisiana State University, 1939), pp. 106-108.

of logical reasoning as applied to these areas. The works were written on a general high school level and appeared between 1929 and 1944. The conclusions to this study were:

1. Debating performs a vital function in modern education.
2. Debating stresses argument, applied logic, rather than logic itself--the science of thinking.
3. Nevertheless, an understanding of syllogistic logic will enable the debater to handle more effectively the argumentative process.
4. Persuasion and conviction are equally applicable argumentative techniques.
5. Deduction and induction are important in argumentative discourse.
6. Deduction and induction are interdependent processes.
7. Induction is more applicable than deduction in argumentative techniques.
8. A knowledge of fallacies enables the debater to deal more effectively with logical reasoning.
9. Treatment in text is essentially Aristotelian.<sup>14</sup>

In May, 1959, the Michigan High School Forensic Association surveyed the high school debate coaches in this state. The findings revealed that only 33 teachers had bachelor's degrees in speech, whereas 21 had majors in

---

<sup>14</sup>James W. Parkerson, "The Place of Logical Reasoning in Representative Works of Argumentation, Debate, and Discussion, of the High School Level" (abstract of Master's thesis, Department of Speech, State University of Iowa, 1950), Speech Monographs XVII (August, 1950), p. 247.

English and 29 others had majors in fields of history, mathematics, French, social science, philosophy, psychology, chemistry, and natural science. The survey also revealed that of those coaches who had both a bachelor's and a master's degree, only 8 had both degrees in speech, while 37 had neither degree in speech.<sup>15</sup>

Becker, Brown, and Murphy discovered that 70 per cent of the high school debate teams in Michigan were coached by teachers who do not teach the speech course.<sup>16</sup>

The Alexander-Thomas survey revealed that debate coaches would like assistance in solving coaching problems,<sup>17</sup> and the Shug study revealed that 69 per cent of the school administrators and teachers other than debate coaches felt that "debate needs coaches with better training and a more wholesome philosophy of debate."<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup>"Debate Questionnaire Precis," Forensic News, No. 1 (September 10, 1959), pp. 8-9.

<sup>16</sup>Albert Becker, Charles T. Brown, and Jack W. Murphy, "Speech Teaching in Michigan," The Speech Teacher, I (March, 1952), pp. 137-40.

<sup>17</sup>Frederick Alexander and Gordon Thomas, "The High School Speech Teacher in Michigan," The Speech Teacher, IX (September, 1960), pp. 189-91.

<sup>18</sup>Clayton H. Shug, "A Study of Attitude Towards Debate," The Speech Teacher, I (November, 1952), pp. 242-52.



### Justification

From the review of the preceding studies it appears that there is need for further research in an effort to improve the training of high school debaters.

Many debate coaches, especially the beginners, are confronted with the problem of developing an effective presentation of reasoning and evidence. In some school systems the debate program is an extracurricular activity that meets during the "spare" time of the coach. In other school systems the debate program is integrated into the academic schedule. There are still other situations in which the debate program is carried out through a related class, e.g., a public speaking class. The length of the debate program is also varied. In some schools debate is taught for one semester; in other schools, for an entire year. With various debate programs, one can imagine that there are many effective, in some instances ineffective, methods, as well as effective and ineffective materials used in the teaching of reasoning and evidence.

It is believed that this study will be helpful to the inexperienced debate coach who would undoubtedly be interested in knowing something about the methods and materials that are employed. It is believed that this study

will also be helpful in assisting the experienced coach in the evaluation of his program of teaching debate.

It is hoped that this study will prove useful to colleges and universities which train speech teachers inasmuch as these institutions will be provided with information which should be of help in coping with some of the problems which so often confront a first-year coach.

### Plan of the Study

The procedure of this study was to survey the debate coaches in the public and parochial schools in the state of Michigan in order to compile, categorize, and analyze the classifications of reasoning and evidence taught and the methods and materials used in the teaching. In order to obtain tried-approved or effective methods, the survey was limited to debate coaches of the Michigan High School Forensic Association who had taught or coached debaters for a consecutive three-year period. This limitation was made with the thought in mind that these instructors may have a definite plan or course of study which has been found effective.

## Definitions

Several words which appear throughout the study are defined in the following paragraphs. The definitions are provided in order to make for a clear understanding of the survey.

Methods.--The definition, taken from Webster's New World Dictionary of the American Language, is: "a way of doing anything; mode; procedure; or way of teaching, investigating, etc." The following parts of this study will be termed methods: Teacher's Lecture, Teacher's Demonstration, Debaters' Research, Debaters' Demonstration, Class Discussion, Panel Discussion, and Guest Expert.

Materials.--The definition, taken from Webster's New World Dictionary of the American Language, is: "notes, visual aids, and ideas used in teaching." In this study Debate Handbooks, Assigned Class Textbook, Library of Textbooks, Study Sheets, Study Sheet Outlines, Movies, Film Strips, and Summer Clinics are considered materials.

Reasoning.--The word is defined by Courtney and Capp in their book Practical Debating as "The process by which we infer a conclusion from a premise."<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>19</sup>Luther W. Courtney and Glenn R. Capp, Practical Debating (Chicago: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1949), p. 114.

Evidence.--The definition is taken from Practical Debating: "Any factual material or opinion used to establish the truth or falsity of a given statement."<sup>20</sup>

### Organization

The study is divided into five chapters in order to present the findings in a comprehensible form. Following this chapter, Chapter II presents a description of the procedure used in the development of the survey. Chapter III tabulates Part I of the survey. Chapter IV is a tabulation of Part II of the survey. Chapter V presents the results, questions developed from the survey, speculations and implications, and suggested areas for further study. A bibliography and appendixes of related and useful materials follows Chapter V.

---

<sup>20</sup>Ibid., p. 84.

## CHAPTER II

### PROCEDURE OF THE SURVEY

The 1958-59 directory of the Michigan High School Forensic Association listed 96 teachers who had coached debate for a consecutive three-year period or longer. Eighteen changes were discovered in checking the directory of the 1959-60 school year. Consequently, in order to stay within the limitations of the study, 18 changes reduced the number of coaches qualifying for the survey to 78. These coaches represented class A, B, and C high schools, but not class D and E. Schools under the latter classifications were not included since there were none that met the limitations, and, furthermore, in such schools there probably would be a lack of students and staff to carry out a successful debate program.

The classifications of high schools were adopted from the Michigan High School Athletic Association. These classifications are determined by the enrollment of the school: A schools, 900 and over; B schools, 400 to 899; C schools, 200 to 399; D schools, 76 to 199, and E schools,

less than 75.<sup>1</sup>

There were 23 respondents in the A classification, 10 in the B classification, and 10 in the C classification. The forensic division combines the A and B schools into an A division and C and D schools into a B division; therefore, the A division is represented by 33 schools and the B division is represented by 10 schools.

The classifications of reasoning and evidence used in the survey were compiled from the writer's training and coaching experience and are based primarily upon four recognized textbooks on argumentation: Argumentation and Debate by Lionel Crocker;<sup>2</sup> Argumentation, Discussion, and Debate by A. Craig Baird;<sup>3</sup> Argumentation and Debate edited by David Potter;<sup>4</sup> and Practical Debating by Luther W. Courtney and Glenn R. Capp.<sup>5</sup>

The questionnaire was constructed during the summer of 1959 and was tested for reliability by Dr. Willard Warrington, a staff member of the Office of Evaluation Services at Michigan State University. It was tested for

---

<sup>1</sup>Bulletin of the Michigan High School Athletic Association, XXXVI (November, 1959), p. 97.

<sup>2</sup>Crocker, op. cit., passim.

<sup>3</sup>Baird, op. cit., passim.

<sup>4</sup>Potter, op. cit., passim.

<sup>5</sup>Courtney and Capp, op. cit., passim.

readability and continuity by three debate coaches in the Lansing area. With several subsequent alterations the questionnaire was mimeographed, and mailed.

The survey was mailed in two parts. Part I consisted of a form on which respondents checked the types of reasoning and evidence taught in relationship to the methods and materials used in the instruction. Included with the form were a personal letter of introduction and explanation, two letters of endorsement, and, in order to secure a higher percentage of returns, a stamped, self-addressed envelope. Part I was mailed early in October, 1959. Copies of the personal letter and instructions, the endorsements, and the form used may be found in Appendix A.

Part II was divided into three categories: the debate program, methods and materials used, and the instructor's over-all teaching program and duties. Although the questions were not arranged specifically under one of the three categories, in order to conserve space, the questions are treated as such in Chapter IV.

Part II consisted of 28 questions. With the questions were mailed a personal letter of introduction and explanation, two endorsements, and a stamped, self-addressed envelope. Part II was mailed the latter part of October, 1959. A copy of the personal letter, the endorsements, and the questionnaire may be found in Appendix B.

Where there was no return of Part I, that form,

along with an appropriate personal letter, was enclosed with the second mailing.

By the end of November, 1959, the writer felt that there were not as yet sufficient returns from which to draw conclusions; therefore, a last attempt to secure a higher percentage of returns was made the first part of December, 1959.

Endorsements were included in two of the three mailings, presupposing that influential and well-known speech educators' recommendations would result in a greater return. The endorsements were written by Dr. Fred Alexander, member of the Department of Speech at Michigan State University and an active member of the Michigan Speech Association; Dr. Moyne Cabbage, Manager of the Michigan High School Forensic Association; and Dr. Emil Pfister, Head of the Department of Speech and Drama at Central Michigan University, and a member of the Board of the Michigan High School Forensic Association.

Part I brought in a 53.84 per cent return, and Part II brought in a 55.12 per cent return. As a result of the three mailings, 54.45 per cent of those questioned responded to the total questionnaire.

The results of the survey were carefully tabulated on specially prepared forms; responses to questions were tabulated numerically; that is, all replies to a particular question were tabulated before progressing to



another question.

The results of Part I are tabulated and presented in Chapter III, those of Part II, in Chapter IV. Chapter V presents the summary and conclusions to the study.

## CHAPTER III

### TABULATION AND ANALYSIS OF PART I

This chapter presents a tabulation and analysis of the results of Part I of the survey. Although there were 42 respondents to Part I, tabulations will be made from only 40, since two replies did not conform to the questionnaire.

One respondent indicated that he could not fill out the forms as requested because, "I seriously question the value to debating of such extensive logic instructions."

Another respondent stated:

I cannot answer this. I just don't work this way. I do not believe you can effectively teach these things by conscious effort; it must flow out of the activity.

. . . . .

My emphasis has been on subject matter and knowledge of the subject and we spend a great deal of time on just learning the facts. Then we strip away the non-essentials and try to come up with a consolidated logical case which will carry the mail because it is true and is fundamental in approach.

Years of experience have taught me practical matters of logical approach, analysis of evidence and rebuttal methods--always based on the practicalities of the situation.

I have never analyzed my methods. . . .

Both of these replies are important, for they suggest that some coaches teach more from an "inspirational" than from an analytical point of view. The survey, however, was not designed to distinguish and evaluate the methods or philosophies of teaching reasoning and evidence. The purpose of the survey was only to discover what types of reasoning and evidence were used and what instructional methods and materials were employed in the teaching.

The terms used in the Tables referring to the classifications of reasoning and evidence were derived from standard debate and argumentation textbooks, e.g., Argumentation and Debate by Crocker,<sup>1</sup> Practical Debating by Courtney and Capp,<sup>2</sup> and Argumentation and Debate edited by David Potter.<sup>3</sup> No definitions for the terms were provided within the survey. It was assumed that debate teachers who had taught for at least a three-year consecutive period would be familiar with the terms, and it was felt that further insight would be gained from the study if respondents were free to reply in light of their own training and teaching experience.

Several coaches, however, indicated an unfamiliarity with the terms and, consequently, did not complete Part I.

---

<sup>1</sup>Crocker, op. cit., passim.

<sup>2</sup>Courtney and Capp, op. cit., passim.

<sup>3</sup>Potter, op. cit., passim.

From those who did complete Part I, it is inferred that a few were not always certain as to the terminology employed. In spite of this, the writer feels that the survey had a considerable degree of reliability. There are definite reasons to believe that the respondents did not check or answer the questions in the two-fold survey in a haphazard or random manner. For example:

Part II was designed to explain specifically the methods and materials listed in Part I. The relationship between the two parts reflects the respondents' ability to understand the terminology used in Part I. For instance, in Part I the respondents checked as to whether or not they used the various classifications of methods and materials. In Part II the respondents elaborated as to how specific methods and materials were organized for teaching the classifications of reasoning and evidence. The two parts complement each other.

To substantiate further the reliability of the survey, the writer reviewed representative materials used by the respondents in order to detect just how comprehensively reasoning and evidence was covered. Textbooks, though varying in their discussion of reasoning and evidence, did cover the two areas. Movies, too, were found to be helpful in teaching reasoning and evidence. For example, a movie entitled How to Judge Facts deals specifically with common fallacies of reasoning. The debate

handbooks used by the coaches and debaters should be useful and in certain instances are directly helpful in teaching reasoning and evidence (see page 66). The writer also reviewed the materials and the program of the fall clinics which are sponsored by various colleges and universities and found that they definitely attempt to aid debaters in learning reasoning and evidence (see page 69 for further information).

It seems reasonable to conclude, therefore, that the terminology used in the questionnaire was consistently meaningful, and that the items reported did represent to the answerer much the same thing that they did to the questioner. It was the variety of ideas provided by respondents which proved of relevant value and which probably would not have resulted had limited definitions been posed. Therefore, throughout the study each classification of material and method used in teaching reasoning and evidence will be referred to by its special term.

#### Rankings of the Classifications of Reasoning and Evidence

Tables 1 and 2 contain the rankings of the classifications of reasoning and evidence respectively. The figure following each classification indicates the number of coaches teaching that particular form of reasoning and

evidence as indicated by the questionnaire. The second figure following each classification indicates the percentage of coaches teaching that particular form of reasoning and evidence. Both the number of coaches and the percentages are based upon the 40 responses to Part I of the survey.

TABLE 1: RANKING THE CLASSIFICATIONS OF REASONING

Classification	Number of Coaches	Per cent of Coaches
Analogy.....	37.....	92.5
Cause to Effect.....	35.....	85.5
Example.....	33.....	82.5
Effect to Cause.....	31.....	77.5
Generalization.....	30.....	75.0
Effect to Effect.....	27.....	67.5
Categorical Syllogism.....	24.....	60.0
Hypothetical Syllogism.....	21.....	52.5
Disjunctive Syllogism.....	13.....	32.5
Enthymeme.....	7.....	17.2
Sign.....	6.....	15.0

Table 1 indicates that analogy was taught by 37 or 92.5 per cent of the coaches, cause to effect was taught by 35 or 85.5 per cent of the coaches, and example was taught by 33 or 82.5 per cent of the coaches. The following five classifications, effect to cause, generalization, effect to effect, categorical syllogism, and hypothetical syllogism, were taught by at least 50 per cent of the coaches. Disjunctive syllogism, enthymeme, and sign reasoning were the least-taught classifications. None of the classifications was taught by all 40 coaches.

Table 2 indicates that the most-prevalent classifications of evidence taught by coaches surveyed were statistics, examples, authority, and opinions. These four classifications were taught by at least 80 per cent of the coaches, and all of the classifications were taught by at least 50 per cent of the coaches. As in Table 1, Table 2 reveals that none of the classifications was taught by all of the coaches.

TABLE 2: RANKING THE CLASSIFICATIONS OF EVIDENCE

Classification	Number of Coaches	Per cent of Coaches
Statistics.....	36.....	90.0
Example.....	35.....	85.5
Authority.....	35.....	85.5
Opinions.....	32.....	80.0
Primary or Original Sources.....	27.....	67.5
Literal and Figurative Analogies.....	25.....	62.5
Secondary Sources.....	23.....	57.5
Circumstantial.....	20.....	50.0

#### Explanation of Tables 3-40

After having ranked the types of reasoning and evidence, the writer's next step was to tabulate the methods and materials used in the teaching process. Tables 3-40 contain in parenthesis after their titles the number of coaches teaching the particular classification of reasoning

and evidence. Methods and materials are ranked according to the number of coaches using each. No tabulation was made to indicate whether a coach used one or several methods and materials. The figures indicate only the sum number of times that a coach or coaches checked a particular method and/or material. The percentage after each method and material is based on the number of coaches who taught the particular classification of reasoning and evidence and is not based on the number of respondents to the survey.

#### Methods Used in Teaching the Classifications of Reasoning

The first phase of Part I consists of ranking the instructional methods used in teaching each classification of reasoning. The methods are defined as Class Discussion, Teacher's Lecture, Teacher's Demonstration, Panel Discussion, Debaters' Demonstration, Debaters' Research, and Guest Expert.

TABLE 3: ANALOGY (37)

Method	Number of Coaches	Per cent of Coaches
Class Discussion.....	27.....	73.0
Teacher's Lecture.....	23.....	62.2
Teacher's Demonstration.....	23.....	62.2
Panel Discussion.....	18.....	48.6
Debaters' Demonstration.....	11.....	29.7
Debaters' Research.....	11.....	29.7
Guest Expert.....	1.....	2.7



As the tabulations for Table 3 indicate, Class Discussion, Teacher's Lecture, and Teacher's Demonstration ranked the highest, being used by at least 62.2 per cent of the coaches. Panel Discussion was used by 18 coaches, and Debaters' Demonstration and Debaters' Research were each used by 11 coaches. Only 1 coach used Guest Expert.

TABLE 4: CAUSE TO EFFECT (35)

Method	Number of Coaches	Per cent of Coaches
Teacher's Lecture.....	25.....	71.4
Class Discussion.....	17.....	48.6
Teacher's Demonstration.....	15.....	42.9
Debaters' Research.....	15.....	42.9
Panel Discussion.....	13.....	37.1
Debaters' Demonstration.....	10.....	28.6
Guest Expert.....	3.....	8.6

The Teacher's Lecture ranked well above the other methods in teaching cause to effect reasoning, as listed in Table 4. Class Discussion ranked second and was used by 17 of the 35 coaches. Teacher's Demonstration and Debaters' Research tied for third place and were methods used by 42.9 per cent of the coaches. Panel Discussion and Debaters' Demonstration were used by 37.1 and 28.6 per cent respectively of the coaches. The least-used method was Guest Expert.

TABLE 5: EXAMPLE (33)

Method	Number of Coaches	Per cent of Coaches
Teacher's Demonstration.....	25.....	75.8
Class Discussion.....	24.....	72.7
Teacher's Lecture.....	20.....	60.6
Panel Discussion.....	18.....	51.1
Debaters' Research.....	16.....	48.8
Debaters' Demonstration.....	15.....	45.5
Guest Expert.....	1.....	3.0

More than seventy-five per cent of the coaches taught example by means of Teacher's Demonstration. Three other methods, Class Discussion, Teacher's Lecture, and Panel Discussion, were used by more than half of the coaches. Guest Expert, as in previous classifications, was the least used.

TABLE 6: EFFECT TO CAUSE (31)

Method	Number of Coaches	Per cent of Coaches
Teacher's Lecture.....	22.....	71.0
Class Discussion.....	15.....	48.4
Teacher's Demonstration.....	13.....	41.9
Debaters' Research.....	13.....	41.9
Panel Discussion.....	11.....	35.5
Debaters' Demonstration.....	11.....	35.5
Guest Expert.....	3.....	9.7

Table 6 lists the Teacher's Lecture as the method used by 71 per cent of the coaches in teaching effect to



cause reasoning. Class Discussion ranked second, being used by 48.4 per cent of the coaches. Teacher's Demonstration and Debaters' Research tied for third place with 41.9 per cent of the coaches using these methods. Panel Discussion and Debaters' Demonstration were used by 35.5 per cent of the coaches. Guest Expert as a teaching method ranked lowest.

TABLE 7: GENERALIZATION (30)

Method	Number of Coaches	Per cent of Coaches
Class Discussion.....	21.....	70.0
Teacher's Demonstration.....	19.....	63.6
Teacher's Lecture.....	18.....	60.0
Panel Discussion.....	15.....	50.0
Debaters' Demonstration.....	10.....	33.3
Debaters' Research.....	10.....	33.3
Guest Expert.....	1.....	3.3

Table 7 reveals that 70 per cent of the coaches taught generalization by Class Discussion. Teacher's Demonstration, Teacher's Lecture, and Panel Discussion were methods used by at least 50 per cent of the coaches. The methods Debaters' Demonstration and Debaters' Research were used by 33.3 per cent of the coaches. Only 1 coach used Guest Expert.

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

TABLE 8: EFFECT TO EFFECT (27)

Method	Number of Coaches	Per cent of Coaches
Teacher's Lecture.....	20.....	74.1
Class Discussion.....	13.....	48.1
Debaters' Research.....	13.....	48.1
Teacher's Demonstration.....	10.....	37.0
Panel Discussion.....	9.....	33.3
Debaters' Demonstration.....	9.....	33.3
Guest Expert.....	3.....	11.1

The third form of causal reasoning, effect to effect (Table 8), was taught most widely with Teacher's Lecture. Teacher's Lecture was also the most-used method in cause to effect and effect to cause reasoning. A difference of 7 coaches between Teacher's Lecture and the second and third methods is approximately the same for all three forms of causal reasoning. It is significant that Debaters' Research ranked third or higher as a method used in teaching all forms of causal reasoning.

TABLE 9: CATEGORICAL SYLLOGISM (24)

Method	Number of Coaches	Per cent of Coaches
Teacher's Demonstration.....	18.....	75.0
Teacher's Lecture.....	16.....	66.7
Debaters' Demonstration.....	9.....	37.5
Debaters' Research.....	6.....	25.0
Class Discussion.....	5.....	19.2
Panel Discussion.....	4.....	16.7
Guest Expert.....	2.....	8.3

The categorical syllogism was the most-prevalent form of the three types of syllogistic reasoning, but it ranked only seventh in relation to the other classifications of reasoning. The two methods of teaching it given the most tallies in Table 9 were Teacher's Demonstration, used by 75 per cent of the coaches, and Teacher's Lecture, used by 66.7 per cent of the 24 coaches. Table 9 reveals the first area in which Debaters' Demonstration has ranked at least third. Guest Expert ranked last.

TABLE 10: HYPOTHETICAL SYLLOGISM (21)

Method	Number of Coaches	Per cent of Coaches
Teacher's Lecture.....	14.....	66.6
Teacher's Demonstration.....	10.....	47.6
Class Discussion.....	9.....	42.9
Debaters' Demonstration.....	7.....	33.3
Debaters' Research.....	6.....	28.6
Panel Discussion.....	2.....	9.5
Guest Expert.....	2.....	9.5

Teacher's Lecture ranked first as a method of teaching the hypothetical syllogism (Table 10), being used by 66.6 per cent of the 21 coaches. Teacher's Demonstration was used by 47.6 of the coaches.





TABLE 11: DISJUNCTIVE SYLLOGISM (13)

Method	Number of Coaches	Per cent of Coaches
Teacher's Lecture.....	10.....	76.9
Teacher's Demonstration.....	7.....	53.8
Class Discussion.....	5.....	38.5
Debaters' Demonstration.....	5.....	38.5
Debaters' Research.....	3.....	23.1
Guest Expert.....	2.....	15.6
Panel Discussion.....	1.....	7.7

The first five methods in Tables 10 and 11 ranked in the same order. Disjunctive syllogism (Table 11), however, was taught by fewer coaches.

TABLE 12: ENTHYME (7)

Method	Number of Coaches	Per cent of Coaches
Teacher's Lecture.....	6.....	85.7
Teacher's Demonstration.....	5.....	71.4
Class Discussion.....	3.....	42.9
Debaters' Demonstration.....	2.....	28.6
Panel Discussion.....	1.....	14.3
Debaters' Research.....	0.....	0.0
Guest Expert.....	0.....	0.0

The enthymeme (Table 12) was taught by only 7 of the 40 coaches. Six of the 7 coaches used Teacher's Lecture and 5 used Teacher's Demonstration. Debaters' Research and Guest Expert were not used.

. . . . .  
. . . . .  
. . . . .  
. . . . .  
. . . . .  
. . . . .  
. . . . .

. . . . .  
. . . . .  
. . . . .  
. . . . .  
. . . . .  
. . . . .  
. . . . .

TABLE 13: SIGN REASONING (6)

Method	Number of Coaches	Per cent of Coaches
Teacher's Lecture.....	6.....	100.0
Teacher's Demonstration.....	4.....	66.7
Class Discussion.....	3.....	50.0
Panel Discussion.....	3.....	50.0
Debaters' Demonstration.....	2.....	33.3
Debaters' Research.....	1.....	16.7
Guest Expert.....	0.....	00.0

Sign reasoning (Table 13) was taught by only 6 coaches. All 6 coaches used Teacher's Lecture and supplemented it with another method other than Guest Expert.

#### Materials Used in Teaching the Classifications of Reasoning

The second phase of Part I consists of ranking the instructional materials used in teaching each type of reasoning. The materials are defined as Assigned Class Textbook, Debate Handbooks, Film Strips, Library of Textbooks, Movies, Study Sheets, Study Sheet Outlines, and Summer Clinics.

TABLE 14: ANALOGY (37)

Material	Number of Coaches	Per cent of Coaches
Debate Handbooks.....	14.....	37.8
Assigned Class Textbook.....	7.....	18.9
Study Sheet Outlines.....	4.....	10.8
Study Sheets.....	4.....	10.8
Library of Textbooks.....	3.....	8.1
Movies.....	1.....	2.7
Summer Clinics.....	1.....	2.7
Film Strips.....	0.....	0.0

As Table 14 reveals, Debate Handbooks ranked first in teaching analogy, being used by 37.8 per cent of the coaches. Assigned Class Textbook was used by 7 coaches; Study Sheet Outlines and Study Sheets were each used by 4 coaches. Three coaches used a Library of Textbooks. Movies and Summer Clinics were each used by 1 coach.

TABLE 15: CAUSE TO EFFECT (35)

Material	Number of Coaches	Per cent of Coaches
Debate Handbooks.....	12.....	34.3
Assigned Class Textbook.....	11.....	31.4
Study Sheets.....	5.....	14.3
Study Sheet Outlines.....	4.....	11.4
Library of Textbooks.....	3.....	8.6
Movies.....	1.....	2.9
Summer Clinics.....	1.....	2.9
Film Strips.....	0.....	0.0

Debate Handbooks was a material used by 12 of the 35 coaches teaching cause to effect reasoning. Assigned Class Textbook was used by 11 coaches. Each of the other materials was used by 5 or fewer of the coaches.

TABLE 16: EXAMPLE (33)

Material	Number of Coaches	Per cent of Coaches
Debate Handbooks.....	13.....	39.4
Assigned Class Textbook.....	8.....	24.2
Library of Textbooks.....	7.....	21.2
Study Sheets.....	4.....	12.1
Study Sheet Outlines.....	3.....	9.1
Movies.....	1.....	3.1
Summer Clinics.....	1.....	3.1
Film Strips.....	0.....	0.0

In Table 16 Debate Handbooks, used by 13 of the 33 coaches teaching example, ranks first. Eight of the coaches (24.2 per cent) used Assigned Class Textbook; 7, Library of Textbooks. Fewer than 5 coaches used any one of the other materials.

TABLE 17: EFFECT TO CAUSE (31)

Material	Number of Coaches	Per cent of Coaches
Assigned Class Textbook.....	11.....	35.5
Debate Handbooks.....	10.....	32.3
Study Sheets.....	5.....	16.1
Study Sheet Outlines.....	3.....	9.7
Library of Textbooks.....	2.....	6.5
Movies.....	2.....	6.5
Summer Clinics.....	2.....	6.5
Film Strips.....	0.....	0.0

Out of the 31 coaches in Table 17 who taught effect to cause reasoning, 11 (35.5 per cent) used Assigned Class Textbook and 10 (32.3 per cent) used Debate Handbooks. No more than 5 coaches used any one of the other materials.

TABLE 18: GENERALIZATION (30)

Material	Number of Coaches	Per cent of Coaches
Debate Handbooks.....	13.....	43.3
Assigned Class Textbook.....	7.....	23.3
Study Sheet Outlines.....	5.....	16.6
Library of Textbooks.....	2.....	6.7
Study Sheets.....	1.....	3.3
Movies.....	1.....	3.3
Summer Clinics.....	1.....	3.3
Film Strips.....	0.....	0.0

In Table 18, 13 (43.3 per cent) of the 30 coaches teaching generalization used Debate Handbooks; 7, Assigned Class Textbook; 5, Study Sheet Outlines; 2, Library of Textbooks; and 1 each used Study Sheets, Movies, and Summer Clinics. No coaches supplemented instruction with Film Strips.

TABLE 19: EFFECT TO EFFECT (27)

Material	Number of Coaches	Per cent of Coaches
Assigned Class Textbook.....	9.....	33.3
Debate Handbooks.....	7.....	25.9
Study Sheets.....	4.....	14.8
Movies.....	3.....	11.0
Study Sheet Outlines.....	3.....	11.0
Summer Clinics.....	3.....	11.0
Library of Textbooks.....	2.....	7.4
Film Strips.....	0.....	0.0

The Assigned Class Textbook ranks first in Table 19, and Debate Handbooks, second, being used by 33.3 and 25.9 per cent respectively of the coaches teaching effect to effect reasoning. Study Sheets were used by 4 coaches; Movies, Study Sheet Outlines, and Summer Clinics were each used by 3 coaches. Two coaches used Library of Textbooks. Film Strips were not used.

TABLE 20: CATEGORICAL SYLLOGISM (24)<sup>1</sup>

Material	Number of Coaches	Per cent of Coaches
Debate Handbooks.....	5.....	20.8
Library of Textbooks.....	5.....	20.8
Assigned Class Textbook.....	4.....	16.7
Study Sheet Outlines.....	2.....	8.3
Study Sheets.....	1.....	4.2
Summer Clinics.....	1.....	4.2
Film Strips.....	0.....	0.0
Movies.....	0.....	0.0

Debate Handbooks and Library of Textbooks were each used by 5 coaches in teaching the categorical syllogism as indicated in Table 20. This included only 20.8 per cent of the 24 coaches. Assigned Class Textbook was used by 4 coaches; Study Sheet Outlines, 2 coaches; and Study Sheets and Summer Clinics each, 1 coach.

<sup>1</sup>The number of materials does not equal the number of coaches since a coach or coaches sometimes used a method in place of a material and vice versa.

TABLE 21: HYPOTHETICAL SYLLOGISM (21)

Material	Number of Coaches	Per cent of Coaches
Debate Handbooks.....	5.....	23.8
Library of Textbooks.....	5.....	23.8
Study Sheets.....	5.....	23.8
Assigned Class Textbook.....	3.....	14.3
Film Strips.....	0.....	0.0
Movies.....	0.....	0.0
Study Sheet Outlines.....	0.....	0.0
Summer Clinics.....	0.....	0.0

Table 21 indicates that Debate Handbooks, Library of Textbooks, and Study Sheets were each used by 5 of the coaches (23.8 per cent) in teaching the hypothetical syllogism. Three coaches used Assigned Class Textbook. The other materials were not used in teaching this particular type of reasoning.

TABLE 22: DISJUNCTIVE SYLLOGISM (13)

Material	Number of Coaches	Per cent of Coaches
Debate Handbooks.....	4.....	30.8
Assigned Class Textbook.....	3.....	23.1
Library of Textbooks.....	3.....	23.1
Study Sheet Outlines.....	2.....	15.4
Study Sheets.....	1.....	7.7
Film Strips.....	0.....	0.0
Movies.....	0.....	0.0
Summer Clinics.....	0.....	0.0



Only 13 coaches taught the disjunctive syllogism, and Table 22 reveals that none of the coaches used more than one material. Debate Handbooks was used by 4 coaches (30.8 per cent); Assigned Class Textbook and Library of Textbooks each, 3 coaches; Study Sheet Outlines, 2 coaches; and Study Sheets, 1 coach. Film Strips, Movies, and Summer Clinics were not used.

TABLE 23: ENTHYMEME (7)

Material	Number of Coaches	Per cent of Coaches
Assigned Class Textbook.....	4.....	57.1
Library of Textbooks.....	2.....	28.6
Debate Handbooks.....	1.....	14.3
Film Strips.....	0.....	0.0
Movies.....	0.....	0.0
Study Sheet Outlines.....	0.....	0.0
Study Sheets.....	0.....	0.0
Summer Clinics.....	0.....	0.0

Seven coaches taught the enthymeme; Table 23 reveals that 57.1 per cent of these coaches used Assigned Class Textbook as a material. Library of Textbooks was used by 2 coaches, and Debate Handbooks was used by 1 coach. Other materials listed were not used.

TABLE 24: SIGN REASONING (6)

Material	Number of Coaches	Per cent of Coaches
Debate Handbooks.....	2.....	33.3
Assigned Class Textbook.....	1.....	16.7
Library of Textbooks.....	1.....	16.7
Study Sheet Outlines.....	1.....	16.7
Summer Clinics.....	1.....	16.7
Film Strips.....	0.....	0.0
Movies.....	0.....	0.0
Study Sheets.....	0.....	0.0

Table 24 indicates that of the 6 coaches teaching sign reasoning, 2 used Debate Handbooks and 1 each used Assigned Class Textbook, Library of Textbooks, Study Sheet Outlines, and Summer Clinics.

#### Methods Used in Teaching the Classifications of Evidence

The third phase of Part I deals with ranking the instructional methods used in teaching the classifications of evidence. The methods of teaching evidence are defined as Class Discussion, Debaters' Demonstration, Debaters' Research, Guest Expert, Panel Discussion, Teacher's Demonstration, and Teacher's Lecture.

TABLE 25: STATISTICS (36)

Method	Number of Coaches	Per cent of Coaches
Debaters' Research.....	24.....	66.7
Teacher's Lecture.....	22.....	61.1
Class Discussion.....	20.....	55.6
Panel Discussion.....	18.....	50.0
Teacher's Demonstration.....	18.....	50.0
Debaters' Demonstration.....	18.....	50.0
Guest Expert.....	7.....	19.4

Debaters' Research was used by 66.7 per cent of the coaches teaching statistics, as revealed in Table 25. Teacher's Lecture, used by 61.1 per cent of the coaches, ranked second. Class Discussion was used by 55.6 per cent. Panel Discussion, Teacher's Demonstration, and Debaters' Demonstration tied for fourth place, each being used by 50 per cent of the coaches. Only 19.4 per cent of the coaches used Guest Expert.

TABLE 26: EXAMPLE (35)

Method	Number of Coaches	Per cent of Coaches
Debaters' Research.....	26.....	74.3
Class Discussion.....	21.....	60.0
Teacher's Demonstration.....	21.....	60.0
Teacher's Lecture.....	17.....	48.7
Panel Discussion.....	16.....	45.7
Debaters' Demonstration.....	13.....	37.1
Guest Expert.....	5.....	14.3

Table 26 reveals Debater's Research as the method used by 74.3 per cent of the coaches. Class Discussion and Teacher's Demonstration were each used by 60 per cent of the coaches. Teacher's Lecture, Panel Discussion, and Debaters' Demonstration were used respectively by 48.7, 45.7, and 37.1 per cent of the coaches. Five coaches, or 14.3 per cent, used Guest Expert as a method in teaching example.

TABLE 27: AUTHORITY (35)

Method	Number of Coaches	Per cent of Coaches
Class Discussion.....	23.....	65.7
Debaters' Research.....	21.....	60.0
Teacher's Demonstration.....	18.....	51.4
Panel Discussion.....	17.....	48.6
Teacher's Lecture.....	17.....	48.6
Debaters' Demonstration.....	15.....	42.9
Guest Expert.....	7.....	20.0

In teaching authority Class Discussion was used by 65.7 per cent of the coaches as indicated in Table 27. Debaters' Research and Teacher's Demonstration were used respectively by 60 and 51.4 per cent of the coaches. Panel Discussion and Teacher's Lecture tied for third place, being used by 48.6 per cent of the coaches. Debaters' Demonstration and Guest Expert were used respectively by 42.9 and 20 per cent of the coaches.

TABLE 28: OPINIONS (32)

Method	Number of Coaches	Per cent of Coaches
Debaters' Research.....	22.....	68.8
Class Discussion.....	21.....	65.6
Teacher's Lecture.....	18.....	56.3
Debaters' Demonstration.....	16.....	50.0
Teacher's Demonstration.....	16.....	50.0
Panel Discussion.....	13.....	40.6
Guest Expert.....	6.....	16.7

Debaters' Research ranked first in Table 28, being used by 68.8 per cent of the coaches teaching opinions. Class Discussion was used by 65.6 per cent of the coaches; Teacher's Lecture, 56.3; Debaters' Demonstration and Teacher's Demonstration each, 50; Panel Discussion, 40.6; and Guest Expert, 16.7.

TABLE 29: PRIMARY OR ORIGINAL SOURCES (27)

Method	Number of Coaches	Per cent of Coaches
Debaters' Research.....	18.....	66.7
Class Discussion.....	17.....	63.3
Teacher's Lecture.....	17.....	63.3
Teacher's Demonstration.....	12.....	44.4
Panel Discussion.....	11.....	40.7
Debaters' Demonstration.....	8.....	29.6
Guest Expert.....	4.....	14.8

Debaters' Research was used by 66.7 per cent of the coaches as a method in teaching primary or original

sources as shown in Table 29. Class Discussion and Teacher's Lecture each were used by 63.3 per cent of the coaches. Teacher's Demonstration and Panel Discussion were used respectively by 44.4 and 40.7 per cent of the coaches. Only 4 coaches, or 14.8 per cent, used Guest Expert.

TABLE 30: LITERAL AND FIGURATIVE ANALOGIES (25)

Method	Number of Coaches	Per cent of Coaches
Class Discussion.....	15.....	60.0
Teacher's Demonstration.....	13.....	52.0
Teacher's Lecture.....	11.....	44.0
Debaters' Demonstration.....	9.....	36.0
Debaters' Research.....	9.....	36.0
Panel Discussion.....	8.....	32.0
Guest Expert.....	3.....	12.0

Table 30 reveals Class Discussion, Teacher's Demonstration, and Teacher's Lecture, used respectively by 60, 52, and 44 per cent of the coaches, to be the prevailing methods in teaching literal and figurative analogies. Debaters' Research, which ranked first or second in the five previous classifications of evidence, tied with Debaters' Demonstration for fourth place and was used by only 36 per cent of the coaches. Thirty-two per cent of the coaches used the Panel Discussion; 12 per cent, Guest Expert.

TABLE 31: SECONDARY SOURCES (23)

Method	Number of Coaches	Per cent of Coaches
Class Discussion.....	17.....	73.9
Teacher's Lecture.....	16.....	69.6
Debaters' Research.....	13.....	56.5
Teacher's Demonstration.....	12.....	52.2
Panel Discussion.....	9.....	39.1
Debaters' Demonstration.....	7.....	30.4
Guest Expert.....	5.....	21.7

As indicated in Table 31, the methods most used in teaching secondary sources were Class Discussion and Teacher's Lecture, being used respectively by 73.9 and 69.6 per cent of the coaches. Debaters' Research and Teacher's Demonstration were used respectively by 56.5 and 52.2 per cent of the coaches. Panel Discussion, Debaters' Demonstration, and Guest Expert were the least used with respective percentages of 39.1, 30.4, and 21.7.

TABLE 32: CIRCUMSTANTIAL (20)

Method	Number of Coaches	Per cent of Coaches
Class Discussion.....	14.....	70.0
Teacher's Lecture.....	12.....	60.0
Debaters' Research.....	10.....	50.0
Teacher's Demonstration.....	9.....	45.0
Panel Discussion.....	8.....	40.0
Debaters' Demonstration.....	7.....	35.0
Guest Expert.....	1.....	5.0

Table 32 reveals that of the 20 coaches teaching circumstantial evidence, 70 per cent used Class Discussion, 60 per cent used Teacher's Lecture, and 50 per cent used Debaters' Research. Teacher's Demonstration and Panel Discussion were methods used by 45 and 40 per cent of the coaches respectively. Seven coaches, or 35 per cent, used Debaters' Demonstration; and only 1 coach used Guest Expert.

#### Materials Used in Teaching the Classifications of Evidence

The fourth phase of Part I ranks the instructional materials used in teaching the classifications of evidence. The materials are defined as Assigned Class Textbook, Debate Handbooks, Film Strips, Library of Textbooks, Movies, Study Sheet Outlines, Study Sheets, and Summer Clinics.

TABLE 33: STATISTICS (36)

Material	Number of Coaches	Per cent of Coaches
Debate Handbooks.....	20.....	55.6
Assigned Class Textbook.....	8.....	22.2
Library of Textbooks.....	8.....	22.2
Study Sheet Outlines.....	4.....	11.1
Study Sheets.....	1.....	2.8
Film Strips.....	0.....	0.0
Movies.....	0.....	0.0
Summer Clinics.....	0.....	0.0



Out of the 36 coaches teaching statistics, 20, or 55.6 per cent, used Debate Handbooks as pointed out in Table 33. The ranking of Debate Handbooks first may have resulted from respondents considering it, not as a source for teaching evidence, but as a source for finding statistical evidence for debating. This may also be true in other tables. Less than 25 per cent of the coaches used any one of the other materials. Assigned Class Textbook and Library of Textbooks were each used by 8 coaches. Four coaches used Study Sheet Outlines, and 1 coach used Study Sheets. The other materials listed were not used.

TABLE 34: EXAMPLE (35)

material	Number of Coaches	Per cent of Coaches
Debate Handbooks.....	21.....	60.0
Assigned Class Textbook.....	8.....	22.9
Library of Textbooks.....	7.....	20.0
Study Sheet Outlines.....	6.....	17.1
Study Sheets.....	3.....	8.6
Film Strips.....	0.....	0.0
Movies.....	0.....	0.0
Summer Clinics.....	0.....	0.0

In Table 34 Debate Handbooks was used by 21 coaches and was the only material used by more than 50 per cent of the coaches teaching example. Eight coaches used Assigned Class Textbook; 7, Library of Textbooks; 6, Study Sheet Outlines; and 3, Study Sheets. Film Strips, Movies, and Summer Clinics were not used.

TABLE 35: AUTHORITY (35)

Material	Number of Coaches	Per cent of Coaches
Debate Handbooks.....	17.....	48.6
Assigned Class Textbook.....	10.....	28.6
Study Sheet Outlines.....	5.....	14.3
Library of Textbooks.....	3.....	8.6
Movies.....	1.....	2.9
Study Sheets.....	1.....	2.9
Summer Clinics.....	1.....	2.9
Film Strips.....	0.....	0.0

None of the materials listed in Table 35 was used by 50 per cent or more of the coaches teaching authority. Debate Handbooks was used by 17 of the 35 coaches. Assigned Class Textbook was used by 10 of the coaches; Study Sheet Outlines, 5; Library of Textbooks, 3; Movies, Study Sheets, and Summer Clinics each, 1. No coaches used Film Strips.

TABLE 36: OPINIONS (32)

Material	Number of Coaches	Per cent of Coaches
Debate Handbooks.....	16.....	50.0
Assigned Class Textbook.....	8.....	25.0
Study Sheet Outlines.....	5.....	15.6
Library of Textbooks.....	3.....	9.3
Study Sheets.....	2.....	6.3
Film Strips.....	0.....	0.0
Movies.....	0.....	0.0
Summer Clinics.....	0.....	0.0

In Table 36 Debate Handbooks was the only material used by at least 50 per cent of the coaches teaching opinions. Sixteen of the 32 coaches used Debate Handbooks. Assigned Class Textbook ranked second and was used by only 8 of the coaches. Five coaches used Study Sheet Outlines; 3, Library of Textbooks; and 2, Study Sheets. Other materials listed were not used.

TABLE 37: PRIMARY OR ORIGINAL SOURCES (27)

Material	Number of Coaches	Per cent of Coaches
Debate Handbooks.....	12.....	44.4
Assigned Class Textbook.....	6.....	22.2
Study Sheet Outlines.....	4.....	14.8
Library of Textbooks.....	3.....	11.1
Study Sheets.....	3.....	11.1
Film Strips.....	0.....	0.0
Movies.....	0.....	0.0
Summer Clinics.....	0.....	0.0

Of the 27 coaches teaching primary or original sources (Table 37), 12, or 44.4 per cent, used Debate Handbooks. Assigned Class Textbook was used by only 6 coaches; Study Sheet Outlines, 4; Library of Textbooks and Study Sheets each, 3. Film Strips, Movies, and Summer Clinics were not used.

TABLE 38: LITERAL AND FIGURATIVE ANALOGIES (25)

Material	Number of Coaches	Per cent of Coaches
Debate Handbooks.....	6.....	24.0
Assigned Class Textbook.....	5.....	20.0
Library of Textbooks.....	3.....	12.0
Study Sheet Outlines.....	3.....	12.0
Study Sheets.....	2.....	8.0
Film Strips.....	0.....	0.0
Movies.....	0.....	0.0
Summer Clinics.....	0.....	0.0

Of the 25 coaches teaching analogies, only 19 used materials listed in Table 38. No one material was used by more than 24 per cent of the coaches. As in previous tables, Film Strips, Movies, and Summer Clinics were not used at all.

TABLE 39: SECONDARY SOURCES (23)

Material	Number of Coaches	Per cent of Coaches
Debate Handbooks.....	9.....	39.1
Assigned Class Textbook.....	4.....	17.4
Study Sheets.....	2.....	8.7
Study Sheet Outlines.....	2.....	8.7
Library of Textbooks.....	1.....	4.3
Film Strips.....	0.....	0.0
Movies.....	0.....	0.0
Summer Clinics.....	0.....	0.0

As indicated in Table 39, 9 of the 23 coaches teaching secondary sources used Debate Handbooks, as a

material; 4, Assigned Class Textbook; 2, Study Sheets; 2, Study Sheet Outlines; and 1, Library of Textbooks. A total of 18 out of 23 coaches used the materials listed.

TABLE 40: CIRCUMSTANTIAL (20)

Material	Number of Coaches	Per cent of Coaches
Debate Handbooks.....	6.....	30.0
Assigned Class Textbook.....	4.....	20.0
Library of Textbooks.....	3.....	15.0
Study Sheet Outlines.....	2.....	10.0
Movies.....	1.....	5.0
Study Sheets.....	1.....	5.0
Film Strips.....	0.....	0.0
Summer Clinics.....	0.....	0.0

Table 40 reveals the first time that Movies was used as a material in teaching evidence. (See page 111 for details on the use of movies as a material in teaching circumstantial evidence.) Other materials ranking above Movies include Debate Handbooks, Assigned Class Textbook, Library of Textbooks, and Study Sheet Outlines, and Study Sheets. None of the materials was used by more than 30 per cent of the coaches. No coaches used Film Strips or Summer Clinics.

## Summary of Methods Used in Teaching Reasoning

Syllogistic reasoning.--As a whole, categorical syllogism ranked seventh, hypothetical syllogism ranked eighth, and the disjunctive syllogism ranked ninth out of eleven classifications of reasoning. According to this study approximately 60 per cent of the coaches taught the hypothetical syllogism, and 30 per cent taught the disjunctive syllogism. In teaching the syllogisms the two prevalent methods were Teacher's Lecture and Teacher's Demonstration. Class Discussion, Debaters' Demonstration, and Debaters' Research were of significance. The methods least used were Panel Discussion and Guest Expert. The enthymeme was ranked tenth as a classification of reasoning, being taught by only 7 coaches, or 17.2 per cent. The first- and second-ranking methods used in teaching the enthymeme were Teacher's Lecture and Teacher's Demonstration respectively.

Causal reasoning.--According to the survey, cause to effect ranked second, effect to cause ranked fourth, and effect to effect ranked sixth in the eleven classifications of reasoning. In teaching causal reasoning the top-ranked method was Teacher's Lecture, followed by Class Discussion. The seven methods were ranked in the same order for effect to cause and cause to effect. If Debaters' Research and Teacher's Demonstration had not been in

contraposition in the rankings of effect to effect, it (effect to effect) would have been ranked identically with the other causal reasonings. Beginning with the most-frequently-used method for teaching syllogistic reasoning, the order was as follows: Teacher's Lecture, Class Discussion, Teacher's Demonstration, Debaters' Research (the last two methods being ranked in contraposition for effect to effect), Panel Discussion, Debaters' Demonstration, and Guest Expert.

Sign reasoning was taught by only 6 coaches. All 6 coaches used Teacher's Lecture, supplemented by another method or methods other than Guest Expert.

Analogy, Example, and Generalization.--The three most-prevalent methods used in teaching these classifications of reasoning were Class Discussion, Teacher's Lecture, and Teacher's Demonstration. In each table the fourth-ranked method was Panel Discussion. The methods, Debaters' Research and Debaters' Demonstration, were tied for fifth place in teaching analogy and generalization. In teaching example, however, Debaters' Research ranked fifth and Debaters' Demonstration ranked sixth, being separated by a difference of only 1 coach. Guest Expert ranked last in all three tables.

## Summary of Materials Used in Teaching Reasoning

Syllogistic Reasoning.--All the materials used in teaching the categorical, hypothetical, and disjunctive syllogisms were utilized in one table or another. Debate Handbooks ranked first in the teaching of these classifications, being tied for first once by Library of Textbooks. The use of Assigned Class Textbook, Library of Textbooks, Study Sheets and Study Sheet Outlines was very prominent in the totals and, therefore, these materials are assumed to be instrumental in the teaching process. In only 1 instance, the categorical syllogism, did a coach indicate the use of Summer Clinics as a method of teaching syllogistic reasoning. Film Strips and Movies were not used. The teaching of the enthymeme involved three materials: Assigned Class Textbook, Library of Textbooks, and Debate Handbooks. Of the 40 respondents, 7 taught the enthymeme.

Causal Reasoning.--The prevalent materials used in teaching cause to effect, effect to cause, and effect to effect were Assigned Class Textbook and Debate Handbooks. Film Strips was not used. The other materials did not form any pattern in the rankings; however, all seemed to be useful to some extent. Sign reasoning was taught by 6 coaches: 2 used Debate Handbooks, and 4 coaches each used one material from Assigned Class Textbook, Library of Textbooks, Study Sheet Outlines, and Summer Clinics.



Analogy, Example, and Generalization.--The most-frequently-used material for teaching analogy, generalization, and example was Debate Handbooks. In all three tables the second-ranked material was Assigned Class Textbook. No pattern of rank developed in using Study Sheet Outlines, Study Sheets, and Library of Textbooks. Movies and Summer Clinics were each used by 1 coach. None of the coaches used Film Strips.

#### Summary of Methods Used in Teaching Evidence

In comparing the classifications of evidence to the methods used in the instruction, one can observe a closely-ranked number of methods for teaching each classification. The study reveals that all methods were well used with the exception of Guest Expert.

Debaters' Research ranked first in the categories of example, opinions, primary sources, and statistics, whereas Class Discussion was ranked first in teaching analogies, circumstantial, authority, and secondary evidence. The next six methods were closely and interchangeably ranked in the tables. Individual preference seems to be the determinant since no consistent pattern could be deciphered. Although Guest Expert ranked last in all tables, it should be emphasized that the figures represent a sizeable 12 to 20 per cent of the coaches surveyed.

## Summary of Materials Used in Teaching Evidence

Debate Handbooks ranked first in teaching the eight classifications of evidence. Assigned Class Textbook ranked or tied for second in all tables. Study Sheet Outlines ranked third in teaching authority, statistics, analogies, opinions, primary or original sources, and secondary sources; Study Sheet Outlines ranked fourth in the teaching of example and circumstantial evidence. Library of Textbooks tied for second in teaching statistics; ranked third in teaching example, circumstantial, secondary sources, and analogies; and ranked fourth in teaching authority, opinions, and primary or original sources.

The use of Study Sheets in teaching statistics, examples, authority (tied with Movies and Summer Clinics), opinions, analogies, and circumstantial (tied with Movies), ranked fifth. Study Sheets ranked third (tied with Study Sheet Outlines) in the teaching of primary or original sources and fourth in teaching secondary sources. Movies was used in the teaching of authority and circumstantial evidence only; each was used by only 1 coach. Summer Clinics was used once, in the teaching of authority. None of the coaches indicated the use of Film Strips in teaching evidence.

## CHAPTER IV

### TABULATION AND ANALYSIS OF PART II

This chapter presents a tabulation and analysis of the results of Part II of the Survey. The answers to these questions provide insight into and an understanding of the high school debate program and present detailed information on the methods and materials used by the coaches surveyed in teaching reasoning and evidence. The number appearing in parenthesis is identical to its number in the questionnaire. It is hoped that this procedure will allow for efficient and exact reference to the questionnaire which is located in Appendix B.

Question 1 (1): Do your debaters meet daily during the academic school schedule solely as a debate class?

This question was asked to discover if there were a special class for debaters or if debate were taught under other circumstances. Eighteen responded "yes" to this question, and 25, "no." One coach stated that he had a class composed of debaters and general speech students.

Question 2 (2): Is debate taught solely as an extracurricular activity?

Of the 43 responses, 20 answered in the affirmative and 22 answered negatively. In 1 instance students had a choice of taking debate as a class or as an extracurricular activity. Another response indicated that students after the first year were allowed to take debate only as an extracurricular activity. The coach in the latter case stated that debate during the first year was part of the general speech course.

Question 3 (3): Is debate taught as a unit in/or through another course?

In 28 cases debate was not taught through another class, but was purely extracurricular or a class in itself. Of the 14 affirmative replies, 12 stated debate was taught in connection with a general speech class; 1, an English class; 1, an English-speech class; and in 1 other instance debate was a part of a "Performing Arts Curriculum" for advanced students.

Question 4 (4): If debate is taught in another course, what is the title of the course?

There were 31 coaches who did not instruct debaters through another course. Of the 13 who did, 8 taught debaters through beginning speech; 2, through advanced

speech; 1, through "Special English"; 1, through an English course; and 1 coach allowed the students to choose between either a beginning speech or an advanced speech class.

Question 5 (5): How many days a week do you meet with your debaters?

In 19 programs debate was taught five days a week. In 43 programs debate was taught three days a week. In 3 programs debate was taught two days a week. In 5 programs debate was taught one day a week. In 3 instances the debate instruction varied from week to week. One school had a diversified program with freshmen meeting during the seventh hour of the school day for a half hour daily, while the upper classmen met after school one day a week for an hour and a half. Two schools scheduled debate for one or two days; 1 school averaged one to three days; 3 schools averaged two to three days; 1 school averaged two to four days; and 1 coach met with the debaters three to four days.

Question 6 (6): How long are the periods when you meet?

Where the debaters met as a class five days a week, the class period averaged anywhere from forty minutes to sixty minutes in length. In tabulating the other data, no general pattern could be formed as to the amount of time

spent on debate outside the scheduled academic school day. where the debaters met as an extracurricular activity, coaches responded in various ways: "extremes," "odd times," "five to twenty minutes," "an hour and a half," "five times a week," and "several hours a week in evening sessions."

Question 7 (7): Do your debaters receive credit towards graduation for taking debate?

The purpose in asking this question was to obtain understanding of how the administration felt towards debate. Of the 24 replies indicating "yes," 8 schools gave credit even though debate was extracurricular. Eighteen schools answered "no," and 1 school stated that credit was given "sometimes." The coach in the latter case did not elaborate.

Question 8 (8): On what grade level do you begin to coach debaters?

This question was asked with the feeling that the length of time a student spends on debate could help determine the teaching methods and materials. It is interesting to note that in the schools surveyed 19 approached the students in the ninth grade, 18 schools began the debate program in the tenth grade, and only 4 schools waited until the eleventh grade to develop their debaters. There were no schools that had a beginning debate class for seniors only. This does not mean, however, that seniors could not

take debate. One unusual reply read, "We have a reserve coach for the ninth and beginning tenth graders; I coach the tenth, eleventh, and twelfth graders." Another coach stated, "Whenever we can recruit them."

Question 9 (10): Do your debaters use a library of textbooks? Yes\_\_\_\_\_ No\_\_\_\_\_ If so, please list the three books most widely used.

The replies to this question were mainly in the negative. Only 10 schools used a library of textbooks; 30 schools did not. Three respondents misinterpreted the question to mean evidence used in supporting debate cases.

There was no definite pattern as to what books were most commonly used. Twelve books were mentioned, and no one book received more than 4 nominations. A thirteenth book, Argumentation and Debate, was listed, but its author was not given. Table 41 lists the books in alphabetical order with their number of nominations. A bibliography appears in Appendix C.

TABLE 41: LIBRARY OF TEXTBOOKS

Title	Number of Nominations
Argumentation and Debate--Crocker.....	1
Argumentation and Debate--McBurney.....	3
Argumentation and Debate--Potter.....	1
Argumentation and Debate--Foster.....	2
Contest Debating--Summers.....	1
Competitive Debating--Musgrave.....	1
Debate Coaching--Lahman.....	1
Discussion and Debate--Sattler.....	4
Discussion Guidebook for High School Debaters--Pfister...	1
Essentials of Discussion and Debate--Gulley.....	1
How to Debate: A Textbook for Beginners--Summers.....	3
The New American Speech--Hedde.....	2
Principals and Types of Speech--Monroe.....	1

An inconsistency exists in Table 41 when compared to some of the tables in Part I because some coaches failed to fill out both Parts I and II.

Question 10 (11): Do your debaters use an assigned textbook?

The replies to this question were emphatically "no!" Out of the 43 returns only 3 respondents indicated "yes." Two coaches listed So You Want to Discuss and Debate! by Brooks Quimby<sup>1</sup> as the text used, and another coach indicated How to Debate by Summers, Whan, and Rousse<sup>2</sup> as the text.

Question 11 (12): Do you use film strips?

All respondents answered "no." Perhaps this would be a worthy area to develop.

Question 12 (13): Do you use movies?

In only 4 instances did coaches use movies; 39 coaches did not use them. The movies used were obtained from visual aids departments of the University of Michigan

---

<sup>1</sup>Brooks Quimby, So You Want to Discuss and Debate! Portland, Maine: J. Weston Walsh, 1954).

<sup>2</sup>Summers, Whan, and Rousse, op. cit.



and Michigan State University. One coach used ten short movies pertaining to public speaking, research, outlining, composition, and debate and discussion.

In checking with the University of Michigan and Michigan State University, the writer secured a bibliography of appropriate films which are listed in Appendix D.

Although the question was not asked, 1 respondent mentioned that tape recordings were used. The respondent did not elaborate as to the title or the source from which the tape was obtained.

Question 13 (14): Do you use debate handbooks? Yes\_\_\_\_ No\_\_\_\_. If so, please rank in order of preference (In case of tie use the same number-- 1 is highest) \_\_\_\_evidence abstracts, \_\_\_\_strategy, \_\_\_\_briefs, \_\_\_\_bibliography of authorities, or others\_\_\_\_\_.

In response to the first part, 42 stated "yes," and 1 did not reply. Therefore, the writer safely concludes that debate handbooks are an integral part of debate instruction as indicated by these coaches.

The second part of the question received only 23 answers, the smallest number of replies of all the questions included in the survey. Since it was not a separate question, non-respondents were probably not aware of it.

Of the coaches who did respond, however, the ranking of the units within the handbooks was as follows: the unit "briefs" ranked first with 11 first-place votes;

"evidence abstracts" and "bibliography of authorities" tied for second with 7 first-place votes each; and "strategy" ranked last with 6 first-place votes. The total number of first-place votes exceeds the number of respondents to this question due to some units being ranked equally.

Question 14 (15): Check the handbooks that you use: Emil Pfister's\_\_\_\_, Mid-West\_\_\_\_, NUEA\_\_\_\_, Reference Shelf\_\_\_\_, Walch\_\_\_\_, and Others\_\_\_\_\_.

Forty-one responded to this statement; 2 did not. One of the respondents stated, "different books different years." No differential was made between debate handbooks and discussion handbooks. It was assumed by the writer that since the questionnaire pertained to the use of debate methods and materials that the respondents would interpret the statement as such. The debate handbooks are listed in Table 42 according to the number of nominations.

TABLE 42: HANDBOOKS

Handbooks	Number of Nominations
J. Weston Walch.....	36
NUEA.....	31
Mid-West.....	22
Reference Shelf.....	21
Dr. Pfister's Discussion Guide Book for Debaters.....	10
Marquette.....	4
National Debate Research.....	4
Allan Dale.....	3
Hope Varsity's Manual.....	3
Cambridge.....	1
Chicago Research.....	1
Michigan High School Forensic Pamphlet.....	1
Nebraska.....	1

Totaling the nominations in Table 41 and dividing them by the number of coaches, one finds that each coach used on the average of 3.4 different published debate handbooks.

### Debate Handbooks Review

A brief review of the debate handbooks receiving 3 nominations or more is given in order to draw particular conclusions in Chapter V.

The J. Weston Walch Company publishes several manuals. One entitled So You Want to Discuss and Debate! is specifically written to explain the different types of discussions and debates, the role of discussants and debaters, and the classifications of reasoning and evidence that are used in developing the case.<sup>3</sup> Another annual manual presents briefs, a bibliography, evidence abstracts, and a "Who's Who."<sup>4</sup> No mention is made of reasoning and evidence.

The National University Extension Association publishes yearly two volumes on the debate proposition. The volumes present authoritative speeches on the history

---

<sup>3</sup>Quimby, op. cit.

<sup>4</sup>J. Weston Walch, Debate Handbook on Labor-Management Relations, Vol. II (Portland, Maine: J. Weston Walch, 1959).

and possible issues of the proposition, quotations, and a bibliography from which materials for evidence may be secured.<sup>5</sup>

The Mid-West Debate Bureau's annual handbook<sup>6</sup> contains no specific information on the classifications of reasoning and evidence that might be used. The author, however, devotes approximately 38 pages to special methods of refutation, the role of debaters, and fallacies in reasoning. The book also contains sample briefs, a bibliography, and evidence abstracts.

H. W. Wilson Company is the publisher of The Reference Shelf.<sup>7</sup> The work is published several times a year on timely subjects. The volumes do not give formal instruction in the teaching of reasoning and evidence, but present background information and representative points of view on each topic. The books also contain comprehensive bibliographies that are helpful in the construction of a debate case.

Discussion Guidebook for High School Debaters, by Dr. Emil Pfister,<sup>8</sup> a yearly publication, contains a

---

<sup>5</sup>Bower Aly (ed.), Discussion and Debate Manual, 2 vols. (Columbia, Missouri: Artcraft Press, 1959).

<sup>6</sup>The Debate Review (Normal, Ill.: Mid-West Debate Bureau, 1959).

<sup>7</sup>The Reference Shelf (New York: H. W. Wilson Co., n.d.).

<sup>8</sup>Emil Pfister, Discussion Guidebook for High School Debaters (Mt. Pleasant, Mich.: Central Michigan College Press, 1958).

survey summary of the fundamentals of discussion and debate. The handbook presents the duties of discussants and debaters, an annotated bibliography, significant points of the present proposition, and the rules for planning and judging a debate. The primary purpose of the guidebook is to assist debaters in organizing the "footwork" that is necessary for successful debating. There is little information pertaining to reasoning and evidence as used in building the debate brief.

Marquette University publishes an annual debate handbook.<sup>9</sup> The authors stress the importance of groundwork or research in understanding the proposition. The handbook covers in a very illustrative way the duties and responsibilities of the affirmative and negative teams, evidence abstracts, and roles and tactics of the debate cases. No material pertaining to reasoning and evidence is included.

Allen W. Dale publishes two volumes. Volume I is designed with the annual debate and discussion topics in mind.<sup>10</sup> Volume II is designed "to acquaint pupils with the basic principles of debate. . . ." <sup>11</sup> The books contain

---

<sup>9</sup>Hugo Hellman and Joseph B. Laine, The Labor Problem (Milwaukee: Marquette University, 1959).

<sup>10</sup>Allen W. Dale, Education Problem, Vol. I: Debate Handbook (Kansas City: Dale Publishing Co., 1957).

<sup>11</sup>Allen W. Dale, Education Problem, Vol. II: Advanced Handbook (Kansas City: Dale Publishing Co., 1957), p. 1.

classifications of reasoning and evidence as well as tests for each.

The National Debate Research Company publishes two kinds of handbooks. In addition to a traditional debate handbook,<sup>12</sup> a discussion and debate textbook<sup>13</sup> is also published. The textbook discusses the "tools of reasoning" as fact, opinion, example, and statistics.

Question 15 (16): Please check the following institutions where your debaters attend, fall clinics, fall tournaments, and summer clinics.

The purpose of this request was not to discover that one clinic is more popular than another but to obtain evidence that the clinics and tournaments are or are not useful in teaching reasoning and evidence. After the tabulations were made, the writer wrote to four of the institutions sponsoring clinics or tournaments for materials which he evaluated.

The fall clinics are popular. Only 4 schools did not attend any fall clinic during the 1959-60 school year. The remaining 39 schools attended on the average of 1.77 per school. The greatest number of clinics

---

<sup>12</sup>Jack Solomon, Jr., Labor Management Relations (Chicago: National Debate Research Co., 1959).

<sup>13</sup>William Buys, Jack Murphy, and Bruce Kendall, Discussion and Debate (Chicago: National Debate Research Co., 1957).

attended by any one school was five. Seven fall clinics were sponsored by colleges and universities in the state of Michigan during the 1959-60 school year.

In analyzing materials from four of these clinics, the writer found that the primary purpose of each was to introduce high school debaters to the discussion and debate topics. There was a definite secondary purpose, however, which was to introduce debaters to areas such as "Characteristics of Good Debating," "Effective Arguing," "Building the Debate Case," and "Refutation and Rebuttal."

Twenty-six of the 43 schools attended fall tournaments. At only one of the five tournaments held during the 1959-60 school year was a winner chosen. The primary purpose of the other tournaments was to give the novice and the experienced debater practice in using the elements of debating.

Summer clinics were attended by only 9 of the 43 schools surveyed. The schools attended clinics sponsored by Michigan State University, Montana University, Northwestern University, and the West Ohio District of the National Forensic League.

Question 16 (27): How do guest experts assist in teaching reasoning and evidence?

This question brought several varied and interesting replies. Some coaches interpreted it to mean guests brought into the classroom, while others interpreted it to

mean outside speakers, and still others thought it to mean debate judges. Of the 12 replies to this question, 5 respondents stated that "Our only guest experts are those judges whom we expect to give an oral critique." In 2 cases, the teacher asked the debaters to analyze and evaluate speakers in public speaking situations. In 1 instance a local parish Father lectured on reasoning and evidence, and in another instance the coach invited a college debate team to demonstrate reasoning and evidence through an actual debate and to answer questions. Two respondents stated that the professional personnel at fall clinics were very helpful in teaching reasoning and evidence. One respondent's penmanship could not be deciphered.

Question 17 (18): Do your experienced debaters assist in the instruction of reasoning and evidence?

In response to this question 32 coaches answered "yes," 7 answered "no," and 4 did not answer. Some of the typical comments were: "By having the less experienced present their arguments and then by having the experienced debaters acting as critics-judges;" "By explaining to the rest of the class the reasoning used in the construction of their cases;" "Through demonstration and lecture;" "Discussion groups and sessions where they are leaders;" "Point out weaknesses of argument, choices of authority;" "They work with individuals giving them illustrations and tell



them what to look for in evidence"; "By assigning an experienced debater to a group of inexperienced, and by putting a varsity debater with a beginner in class teams"; "The buddy system"; "By coaching debaters."

Question 17 (25): Briefly describe the study sheet outlines that you use in teaching reasoning and evidence.

Question 18 (26): Please describe the study sheets that are used in teaching reasoning and evidence.

The two classifications of study sheets were given to enable the respondents to answer more accurately. However, since no distinction was made between the two classifications, the questions will be answered together. Typical explanations among the 11 who replied were: "Simple make-believe cases, usually on simple everyday subjects"; "The different types are indicated with several examples under each"; "We prepare cases and discuss these"; "I use materials developed from speech courses that I have taken and found to be helpful"; "As outlined in teaching speech in Florida public schools"; "Taken from texts"; "Use Crocker's fallacies, etc., in ditto form"; ". . . I prepare sets of examples and have students choose the correct answer. I point out errors in reasoning or value of evidence"; "The University of Michigan provides additional outline sheets which we use." The study sheets, thus, were composed from

personal training and experiences, from materials found in textbooks, and from speech departments of higher institutions.

Question 19 (28): Briefly describe demonstrations that are used by the coach in teaching reasoning and evidence.

Eighteen of the 43 returns brought a response in this area. Some of the replies were: "drawing on the blackboard to explain certain types of reasoning (e.g., deductive and inductive)"; "trips to the library"; and "making posters to emphasize or explain a point." Some unusual methods as explained by one coach are:

I use the book How Well Do You Rate? which has many suggestions in it. Also observation test: In advanced plan with two boys, they start an argument in the middle of the class session, ending with a blow being struck by one. Then explanation by each member of the class is given as to what happened. The jury trial is an excellent device too. We make up our own. At times our trials have created a great deal of interest in the school and it is never hard to find an audience when a class wishes to organize one. At times it is particularly interesting when our student lawyers have an opportunity to check cases with professional lawyers, who are most interested and willing to help, in our own area.

Other explanations were: "By examples from past and current debate topics, and everyday situations"; "Teams misuse various techniques and debaters try to spot them"; "Impromptu constructive talks on each side"; "Presentation in logical step by step form from outlines written on the

board"; "Taping and analyzing advertisements."

One comment that was related to this study, but which cannot be classified under any question within the questionnaire is:

My varsity debaters will participate in over one hundred and fifty debates a year. We develop our own cases and cases are developed only through discussion. I never prepare or give a case directly to my debaters. I stress clear thinking, extempore ability, a great deal of research. . . . My people have training in P.A. announcing, radio work, plays, and talent shows.

Question 20 (19): Approximately how much money per year is spent on materials?

In order to find out if there was a correlation between money spent on materials and instructional procedure the question was asked. This question was misinterpreted or not stated clearly, for the amount listed included seasonal expenses other than for teaching reasoning and evidence. The high was \$500, and the low was \$10. The average as compiled from the 43 replies was \$44.45 per school.

Question 21 (17): Of the total time devoted to the training of debaters, approximately what percent is allotted to the teaching of reasoning and evidence?

The question was asked in order to secure additional information about the importance of these areas to the general field of debate. Twelve respondents had no

idea as to the time devoted to these areas. The extremes of time spent were from 10 to 75 per cent. Fourteen respondents stated that they felt about 50 per cent of the time was spent in these areas. Eight returns indicated at least 75 per cent of the time was spent teaching reasoning and evidence. Ten respondents stated that they felt approximately 25 per cent of the time was spent teaching reasoning and evidence. One respondent stated 60 per cent, while another stated approximately 10 per cent. In combining the figures given by the respondents, it was found that an average of 47.7 per cent of the instructional time was spent on teaching reasoning and evidence.

Question 22 (20): Do your debaters have a specific summer debate assignment?

The response was that 11 schools had summer assignments, but that 33 did not.

Question 23 (21): If so, what is the assignment?

The assignment in all 11 cases was to read and become familiar with the following year's debate topic. No coach indicated that the summer assignment was to improve the debaters' reasoning ability, although some coaches felt that the summer clinics were of value in teaching reasoning and evidence.

Question 24 (22): Is coaching your only speech activity?

To this question only 9 of the respondents had debate coaching as their sole speech assignment, 32 had other responsibilities, and 2 did not answer the question.

Question 25 (23): What other activities are your responsibility?

The two major speech activities were directing plays and coaching spring forensics. There were 17 whose added responsibility was the directing of at least one play. Of these 17, 9 directed two plays, and 2 directed three plays. There were 31 coaches responsible for the spring forensics. Of these 31 coaches, 16 also were involved in the directing of at least one play.

Other duties involving debate coaches were class advising, producing assemblies, supplying community programs, and coaching community-sponsored speech contests.

### Summary

Coaches' Environment.--Eighteen of the coaches surveyed taught debate classes which were a part of the regular curriculum; 14 respondents taught debate through another class; and 11 respondents taught debate as an

extracurricular activity.

It cannot be said that the debate coach has a dull moment. Along with teaching a regular load, 32 of the coaches surveyed also had other responsibilities. Seventeen debate coaches were responsible for the directing of at least one school play, approximately 53 per cent of these coaches directed two productions, and approximately 11 per cent (2 coaches) were in charge of three productions. Along with the directing of plays, 31 coaches were delegated the responsibility of directing the spring forensics. Some of the coaches, in addition, were responsible for providing community programs and serving as class advisers.

In 24 instances respondents indicated that the Board of Education felt debate so worthwhile that credit should be given towards graduation. Eight of the schools represented by these respondents gave credit even though debate was considered extracurricular. Nineteen of the schools gave no credit.

Eighty-six per cent of the coaches indicated that the training of interested students in debate began in grades nine and ten. There were only 4 schools that waited until the students' junior year before approaching them. None of the schools developed their debaters in the senior year. This does not mean, however, that seniors were not allowed to debate.

Many of the respondents misinterpreted the question

concerning the amount of money spent for materials in teaching reasoning and evidence. However, it is interesting to note that some schools spent as little as \$10, other schools, as much as \$500, in promoting debate activities.

Materials.--Debate handbooks were used by 42 of the 43 coaches. Twenty-three coaches answered only the second part of the two-fold question. The preferential ranking of the debate handbook units by the coaches were "briefs," "evidence abstracts" and "bibliography" (tied), and "strategy." Thirteen different handbooks were used. Those used by 10 or more coaches were the handbooks published by J. Weston Walch,<sup>14</sup> NUEA,<sup>15</sup> Mid-West,<sup>16</sup> H. W. Wilson Company,<sup>17</sup> and Central Michigan University.<sup>18</sup>

Only 13 schools used either a Library of Textbooks or Assigned Class Textbook. There was a wide variety of textbooks of which the Michigan High School Forensic booklet<sup>19</sup> and the books, How to Debate<sup>20</sup> and Argumentation and

---

<sup>14</sup>Walch, op. cit.

<sup>15</sup>Aly, op. cit.

<sup>16</sup>The Debate Review, op. cit.

<sup>17</sup>The Reference Shelf, op. cit.

<sup>18</sup>Pfister, op. cit.

<sup>19</sup>William M. Sattler, and N. Edd Miller, Discussion and Debate (Ann Arbor, Michigan: Michigan High School Forensic Association, 1959).

<sup>20</sup>Summers, Whan, and Rousse, op. cit.

Debate<sup>21</sup> were the most popular. It can be generally assumed that both the teacher and the debaters referred to these books and others which are listed in Appendix C.

Many ideas were mentioned for developing the Study Sheets and Study Sheet Outlines. Some of them were "examples of classifications of reasoning and evidence"; "information taken from textbooks on classifications of reasoning and evidence"; "simple make-believe cases"; and "outline sheets from the University of Michigan."

None of the coaches used Film Strips. However, 4 coaches used a variety of movies, and 1 coach utilized the tape recorder.

Methods.--The role of the experienced debater was an important method in the instructional program. Thirty-two respondents indicated that the "buddy" system, special demonstrations, and the coaching of inexperienced debaters were the most helpful techniques in teaching reasoning and evidence to the novice as well as to the experienced debater.

As the study indicates, 39 out of 43 schools attended the fall clinics and over 50 per cent attended practice tournaments. These high figures probably indicate that coaches felt practice and listening to judges'

---

<sup>21</sup>James H. McBurney, James M. O'Neill, and Glen E. Mills, Argumentation and Debate (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1951).



critiques were beneficial in teaching reasoning and evidence. Nine coaches sent representatives to summer clinics.

Eighteen respondents indicated the use of demonstrations in teaching reasoning and evidence. Examples given by the coaches included "writing on the blackboard," "using posters for explanation purposes," "setting up class situations," "taping advertisements for analyzations," and "trips to the library."

Twelve respondents indicated the use of Guest Expert. In the majority of these cases, the critic-judge was considered the guest expert. A parish priest and a college debate team were used as guest experts by some of the respondents. In 2 instances assembly speakers were guest experts whom the debaters were assigned to analyze.

Summer assignments consisted of having the debater obtain evidence for the following year's debate and discussion topics. Coaches did not mention how the summer assignment was used in order to improve the debaters' understanding of reasoning and evidence.

## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this chapter is to consider the hypotheses stated in Chapter I in light of the study, to present additional findings, to raise questions provoked by the study, to point out implications of the study, and to offer suggestions for further research aimed at improving Michigan's high school debate program.

#### Discussion of the Stated Hypotheses

The survey, as indicated in Chapter I, was limited to Michigan high school debate coaches who had taught debate for at least three years consecutively. The survey, consisting of two parts, was mailed to 78 coaches, 40 of whom returned Part I and 43 of whom returned Part II. Tabulations were made of the responses to the questionnaire in order to determine the methods and materials used in teaching reasoning and evidence. The hypotheses and findings are as follows:

1. There are particular textbooks used generally

by the experienced debate coaches. The survey revealed that 15 of the 43 respondents used either Assigned Class Textbook or Library of Textbooks. The total number of different textbooks used by these 15 coaches was 14; no pattern of book preference could be detected. Of the 28 coaches not using textbooks, 28 used Debate Handbooks; 25, Class Discussion; 22, Debaters' Demonstration; 22, Teacher's Lecture; 21, Fall Clinics and Tournaments; 20, Debaters' Research; 19, Panel Discussion; 15, Teacher's Demonstration; 5, Summer Clinics; 4, Guest Expert; 3, Study Sheets or Study Sheet Outlines; and 2, Movies. The hypothesis was not substantiated.

2. Debate handbooks are used frequently as a teaching material. This hypothesis was upheld since all the respondents used handbooks. An average of 3.4 different publications of debate handbooks was used by each coach. Handbooks ranked no lower than third (predominately first) as a material used in teaching reasoning and evidence. Preferred units within the handbooks were ranked by the coaches as follows: (1) "briefs," (2) "evidence abstracts" and "bibliography" (tied), and (3) "strategy."

3. Clinics and debate tournaments are major sources in teaching reasoning and evidence. Approximately 85 per cent of the schools represented in the survey attended one or more of the seven clinics conducted in 1959. More than 60 per cent of the schools participated in at least one of

the five sponsored practice tournaments. The materials distributed by the various sponsors of the clinics emphasize the value and role of reasoning and evidence to successful debating. Thus, the hypothesis was affirmed.

4. There are some unique methods and materials being used of which many coaches are unaware. The hypothesis is answered subjectively, since the writer has defined the phrase unique methods and materials to include those which are unusual, different, and individually used. The methods and materials suggested are unique because only two coaches mentioned them. Among the unique ideas presented, one coach indicated usage of the book How Do You Rate? in testing a debater's critical thinking. Another coach employed an actual courtroom situation in which the debaters applied skills. One coach stated that his debaters participated in more than 150 debates, and in another instance a coach mentioned that his students debated at every opportunity. By these examples it is shown that coaches do use unique methods and materials in training their debaters.

5. Experienced debaters are a prime factor in teaching reasoning and evidence. The respondents as a whole supported this hypothesis. Thirty-two coaches listed ways in which experienced debaters served to strengthen the teaching of reasoning and evidence. By presenting debate demonstrations, by coaching inexperienced debaters, by

explaining the analytical development of cases, and by leading discussions, experienced debaters assisted their coaches.

6. The teaching of reasoning and evidence consumes more time than the teaching of other phases of debate. First of all, this hypothesis cannot be affirmed or denied. The survey indicated that the average debate coach spends approximately 40 per cent of his time teaching reasoning and evidence through the various methods and materials. Secondly, the amount of time that one coach devotes to reasoning and evidence may be considered insufficient or excessive by others. There are many variables such as the number of experienced or inexperienced debaters, the experience of the coach, the organization of the debate program, and others which help determine the amount of time allotted to reasoning and evidence.

7. A distinct pattern of the classifications of reasoning and evidence as taught by experienced debate coaches should be revealed by this study. In Table 1 it is revealed that 92.5 per cent of the coaches taught analogy, the first-ranked classification of reasoning. The next two classifications, cause to effect and example, were taught by approximately 80 per cent of the coaches. Effect to cause and generalization were taught by approximately 75 per cent. One classification, effect to effect, was taught by 67.5 per cent. The classifications of syllogistic reasoning were taught from a high of 60 per cent

to a low of 32 per cent of the coaches. The two lowest-ranked classifications of reasoning, enthymeme and sign, were taught by less than 20 per cent of the coaches.

In Table 2 statistics, the first-ranked classification of evidence, was taught by 90 per cent of the coaches. Examples and authority were each taught by 85.5 per cent of the coaches. Eighty per cent taught opinions. Primary or original sources, literal and figurative analogies, secondary sources, and circumstantial were all taught by at least 50 per cent of the coaches. Thus, the percentages for the classifications of reasoning and evidence did not reveal particular classifications that should be taught.

#### Additional Findings of the Survey

The methods and materials used by the 43 respondents according to frequency of usage appear as follows. The first-ranked method was Teacher's Lecture, followed by Teacher's Demonstration, Class Discussion, Debaters' Research, Debaters' Demonstration, Panel Discussion, and Guest Expert in that order.

The highest-ranked material was Debate Handbooks, followed by Practice Tournaments, Study Sheet Outlines and Study Sheets, Library of Textbooks, Summer Clinics, Movies, and Assigned Class Textbook. However, if Library of Textbooks

and Assigned Class Textbook were combined, the percentage would be as great or greater than Debate Handbooks in teaching the three forms of causal reasoning, sign reasoning, example, and the four forms of syllogistic reasoning. On the other hand, Debate Handbooks would still rank first in teaching analogy and generalization. The combined percentage of Library of Textbooks and Assigned Class Textbook was greater than Debate Handbooks in teaching analogy and circumstantial evidence, but less for example, authoritative opinion, primary or original sources, and secondary sources. A possible explanation is that debate handbooks contain many classifications of evidence other than analogy and circumstantial and, therefore, are useful in explaining and instructing students. Debate handbooks generally do not have as many examples of analogous and circumstantial evidence as they do other types.

Over-all, the causal forms of reasoning were checked more frequently by the coaches than were the forms of syllogistic reasoning. Cause to effect was ranked second; effect to cause, fourth; and effect to effect, sixth; out of the eleven classifications. The two most-frequently-used materials for teaching both types of reasoning were Assigned Class Textbook and Debate Handbooks.

The classifications of syllogistic reasoning ranked seventh, ninth, tenth, and eleventh for categorical, hypothetical, disjunctive, and the enthymeme, respectively.

The two most-frequently-used methods were Teacher's Lecture and Teacher's Demonstration, and the two most-frequently-used materials were Debate Handbooks and Library of Textbooks for the teaching of syllogistic reasoning.

Analogy ranked first as a classification of reasoning. Approximately 90 per cent of the respondents taught analogy. Of the two classifications that have not been discussed, example ranked third, being taught by 80.5 per cent of the respondents. Generalization ranked fifth, being taught by 75 per cent of the respondents. The most-frequently-used methods for teaching analogy, example, and generalization were Class Discussion and Teacher's Lecture, and the most-frequently-used materials were Debate Handbooks and Assigned Class Textbook.

It is much more difficult to summarize the data on evidence than on reasoning, as the methods and materials used in teaching evidence are more closely ranked. The most-frequently-used method was Debaters' Research in teaching example, opinions, primary sources, and statistics. Class Discussion ranked first for teaching analogies, authority, and secondary evidence. The most-frequently-used materials were Debate Handbooks and Assigned Class Textbook. However, it should be noted that Library of Textbooks tied Assigned Class Textbook for second place in teaching statistics.

Of the coaches surveyed, 18 had debate classes.



The survey revealed that only 7, or less than one third, used an Assigned Class Textbook or Library of Textbooks. The reason for this is not determined since the writer's purpose was to discover what particular textbooks were being used and whether or not a pattern of preferred books could be found.

Of the 43 respondents, only 9 sent their debaters to summer clinics. It would be interesting to know why more of the experienced coaches do not take advantage of this material in teaching reasoning and evidence.

#### Questions Developed from the Survey

This particular survey raised as many questions as it revealed findings. Therefore, the writer thought it wise to present the questions, answers to which may be helpful in improving the debate program in Michigan. The questions are listed under four headings: Inconsistency in the Answers to the Survey, Teaching Reasoning and Evidence, Materials for Teaching Reasoning and Evidence, and Administrative Matters.

Inconsistency in the Answers to the Survey.--Why was the enthymeme taught by only 7 coaches? Why did analogy rank as the most-frequently-taught classification of reasoning? Why were not all the forms of syllogistic reasoning

taught by an equal number of coaches? Why did not an equal number of coaches teach primary and secondary evidence?

Teaching Reasoning and Evidence.--Since no pattern of reasoning and evidence could be detected, should all the classifications be taught to high school debaters? If not, what classifications should be taught? Is it better to instruct reasoning and evidence to high school debaters through the "inspirational" or the more traditional "lecture" method? Which should be taught first, reasoning or evidence? Or, should they be taught concurrently? The writer has serious doubts about the classifications of reasoning and evidence which he employed in this study, and about those he has found in textbooks. Are they meaningful or useful? Do they convey the same meaning to most coaches?

Materials for Teaching Reasoning and Evidence.--Is there a commendable textbook for high school debaters? If not, why not? What should be the contents of such a textbook? Why did not more coaches use the materials listed in the survey? Why did handbooks rank so high as a teaching material?

Administrative Matters.--What are the feelings of administrators toward debate as a co-curricular activity and/or as a course having equal status in the regular academic curriculum? Should the state or national speech organizations promote the certification of debate coaches in order to raise the quality of coaching and debating?

## Speculations and Implications

The study seems to illuminate very definite weaknesses in the high school debate program. The existence and effect of the weaknesses, however, cannot be substantially proven, nor was it the purpose or design of the study to prove them. The reason for mentioning them is to acquaint the reader with a deeper understanding of the debate program and to stimulate him into serious thinking and possible action which may assist in alleviating the problems and in strengthening the program.

Related debate studies conducted in Michigan have revealed that the typical debate coach is not trained in the field of speech and is, therefore, probably lacking in the formal knowledge and background necessary for effective coaching.<sup>1</sup> That, together with the fact that coaches are responsible for other curricular and co-curricular activities as revealed by this study, probably explains the teaching methods--Teacher's Lecture and Teacher's Demonstration--most frequently used as well as the material--Debate Handbooks--most frequently used. Considering these facts, the question comes to mind, "How beneficial are the lectures and demonstrations if the majority of coaches do not use

---

<sup>1</sup>Becker, Brown, and Murphy, op. cit., pp. 137-40, and Alexander and Thomas, op. cit., pp. 189-91.

materials (other than handbooks), if they lack sufficient training in debate and speech, and if they are responsible for other activities?" A related question is "How do debaters really learn to use reasoning and evidence correctly?"

Akin to the idea of poor preparation on the part of the coach is the variety of methods and materials used. The variety used even by the experienced coaches may suggest that some standardization should be developed in order to raise the quality of instruction. In order to allow more time for teaching reasoning and evidence and to strengthen the role of debate and discussion in society, the writer wishes to suggest a plan.

The writer knows of several experienced debate coaches who do not participate in discussion due to the time required for preparing the debate team, who use only inexperienced and less-capable debaters for discussion purposes, who regulate the information that is to be used in discussion so as not to disclose pertinent debate information. It is with this situation in mind that the writer's plan would include a semester for discussion and a semester for debate. This would allow time for the coach to teach reasoning and evidence as well as permit time for discussion which is a preliminary tool necessary for debate. This plan, however, does not suggest that spring forensic activities lack value, but it does suggest that the present organization of the forensic program hinders the aims and

objectives of discussion and debate.

What are some other ways in which the level of instruction and debate could be upgraded? The general lack of visual aids used in teaching reasoning and evidence seems to indicate that an investigation should be conducted to evaluate their practicality in teaching these phases of debate.

Perhaps departments of speech in institutions of higher learning should develop teams of "experts" who would be able to present demonstrations to high school debaters.

Possibly a study could be made of summer institutes that are sponsored by colleges and universities to seek information as to what they feel debaters should know. From this, possibly, standardization of course content could develop.

It seems to the writer that debate in Michigan is at a low ebb quality-wise. Perhaps the members of the Michigan Speech Association and the faculties of college and university speech departments should begin to think and act concerning their role and responsibility to the high schools in the state. The writer seriously feels that all professional speech educators interested in this particular phase of communication should stimulate action in the revision of speech methods and curricula which train teachers for the coaching of debate and other aspects of the forensic program.

### Areas for Further Study

The implications mentioned seem to allow room for related studies which should help improve the caliber of debate coaching and strengthen its relationship to other academic subjects.

Since the respondents to this survey did not agree on any particular textbook, and since the importance of the classifications of reasoning and evidence was not determined, it would be advisable for the Speech Association of America to sponsor the writing of a textbook designed specifically for the high school debater and debate coach. The textbook should be written so as to be adaptable to either a regularly scheduled class or a co-curricular class.

Another interesting and valuable study would be to determine how the college or university department of speech could better serve the high school in upgrading the level of high school debating.

A third suggestion for further study would be to conduct depth interviews of debate coaches whose programs are considered excellent.

These suggestions, if carried out, could effect a strengthening of the debate program as a whole and of the skills in reasoning and evidence as exercised by each student. Debate and its allied fields are needed in order

to sustain and promote the welfare of society in a democratic nation and in a free world.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Books

- Aly, Bower. (ed.) Discussion and Debate Manual. 2 vols. Columbia, Missouri: Artcraft Press, 1959.
- Baird, A. Craig. Argumentation, Discussion, and Debate. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1950.
- Buys, William, Murphy, Jack, and Kendall, Bruce. Discussion and Debate. Chicago: National Debate Research Co., 1957.
- Cosper, Russell. Teaching Debate in Secondary School. Ann Arbor, Michigan: George Wahr, 1940.
- Courtney, Luther W., and Capp, Glenn R. Practical Debating. Chicago: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1949.
- Crocker, Lionel. Argumentation and Debate. New York: American Book Co., 1944.
- Dale, Allen W. Education Problem. Vol. I: Debate Handbook. Vol. II: Advanced Handbook. Kansas City: Dale Publishing Co., 1957.
- The Debate Review. Normal, Illinois: Mid-West Debate Bureau, 1959.
- Elson, E. F., and Peck, Alberta. The Art of Speaking. New York: Ginn and Co., 1952.
- Hedde, Wilhelmina, and Brigance, William. American Speech. Chicago: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1955.
- Hellman, Hugo E., and Laine, Joseph B. The Labor Problem. Milwaukee: Marquette University, 1959.
- McBurney, James H., and Hance, Kenneth G. Discussion in Human Affairs. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1950.
- McBurney, James H., O'Neill, James M., and Mills, Glen E. Argumentation and Debate. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1951.



Michigan Department of Public Instruction. Handbook of the Michigan High School Athletic Association 1959-60. Lansing, Michigan.

Pfister, Emil R. Discussion Guidebook for High School Debaters. Mt. Pleasant, Michigan: Central Michigan College Press, 1958.

Potter, David. (ed.) Argumentation and Debate. New York: The Dryden Press, 1954.

Quimby, Brooks. So You Want to Discuss and Debate! Portland, Maine: J. Weston Walch, 1954.

The Reference Shelf. New York: H. W. Wilson Co., n.d.

Sattler, William M., and Miller, N. Edd. Discussion and Debate. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Michigan High School Forensic Association, 1959.

Solomon, Jr., Jack. Labor Management Relations. Chicago: National Debate Research Co., 1959.

Summers, Harrison B., Whan, Forest L., and Rousse, T. A. How To Debate. New York: H. W. Wilson Co., 1953.

Walch, J. Weston. Debate Handbook on Labor-Management Relations. Vol. II. Portland, Maine: J. Weston Walch, 1959.

Weaver, Andrew T., Borchers, Gladys L., and Woolbert, Charles H. The New Better Speech. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1941.

#### Articles and Periodicals

Alexander, Frederick, and Thomas, Gordon. "The High School Speech Teacher in Michigan," The Speech Teacher, IX (September, 1960), 189-91.

Becker, Albert, Brown, Charles T., and Murphy, Jack W. "Speech Teaching in Michigan," The Speech Teacher, I (March, 1952), 137-40.

Bulletin of the Michigan High School Athletic Association, XXXVI (November, 1959), 97.

"Debate Questionnaire Precis," Forensic News, No. 1 (September 10, 1959), 8-9.

Discussion and Debate. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Bureau of School Services (September, 1959).

Ehninger, Douglas. "Six Earmarks of a Sound Forensic Program," The Speech Teacher, I (September, 1952) 237-41.

Parkerson, James W. "The Place of Logical Reasoning in Representative Works of Argumentation, Debate, and Discussion, of the High School Level," Speech Monographs, XVII (August, 1950), 247. (Abstract of Master's Thesis, Department of Speech, State University of Iowa, 1950.)

Reeves, J. Walter. "A Secondary Course in Argumentation," Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, XXXVI (May, 1952), 58.

Robinson, Karl F., and Keltner, John W. "Suggested Units in Discussion and Debate for Secondary Schools," Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, XXXVI (May, 1952), 72-78.

Shug, Clayton A. "A Study of Attitude Towards Debate," The Speech Teacher, I (November, 1952), 242-52.

Smith, Carney C. "Practical Procedures in Coaching High School Debaters," Quarterly Journal of Speech, XXIV (1943), 222-34.

#### Unpublished Material

Polk, Lillian Graham. "A Debating Program for Louisiana High Schools, Based on Current Debating League Practices." Unpublished Master's thesis, Agricultural and Mechanical College, Louisiana State University, 1939.

## APPENDIX A

### Personal Letter and Instructions, the Endorsements, and Part I of the Questionnaire

Muskegon Senior High School  
Muskegon, Michigan  
October 6, 1959

Dear Colleague:

I am conducting a survey to find out what materials and methods debate coaches use in teaching reasoning and evidence to their debaters. This questionnaire is the basis for my Master's thesis.

The survey is being conducted in two parts. You will receive Part II the latter part of October. Each part of the survey takes approximately fifteen minutes to complete. Your answers will be kept confidential.

You will receive a special copy of the results for your assistance in helping a graduate student complete his Master's requirements.

Here are the instructions for Part I of the survey:

1. The top list consists of types of reasoning and evidence that you probably teach. You may add other types.
2. The left-hand column consists of possible teaching methods and materials that are used. Please feel free to add more or clarify your answers.
3. For each type of reasoning and evidence that you teach, check the methods and materials that are used in your instruction.

Example:

	Facts	Evidence	Cause to Effect
Panel Discussion			
Class Textbook	x	x	x
Class Discussion	x	x	x
Film Strips		x	

I want to thank you for your cooperation. It certainly is appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

John F. Kirn,  
Debate Coach

MICHIGAN HIGH SCHOOL FORENSIC ASSOCIATION  
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN  
3501 Administration Building  
Ann Arbor, Michigan

September 23, 1959

Dear Debate Coach:

I wish to add my endorsement of the study on the teaching of reasoning and evidence being conducted by one of our fellow debate coaches, Mr. John Kirn.

The results of this undertaking will be significant only if each debate coach carefully completes Mr. Kirn's questionnaire. I urge your cooperation.

Thank you.

Yours sincerely,

Moyne L. Cabbage  
Manager

MLC/ml

CENTRAL MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY

Mount Pleasant, Michigan  
September 25, 1959

To Whom It May Concern:

John F. Kirn is an alumnus of Central Michigan University and is at present a director of forensics at Muskegon. For his graduate thesis he is making a survey of teaching methods and materials used in instructing high school debaters. This study, if completed, will have real value to speech teachers. Therefore, I am urging that you take the time to complete his questionnaire and thus be of further service to our profession.

Sincerely,

Emil Pfister, Head  
Department of Speech & Drama

EP:bb



For each type of reasoning and evidence that you teach, please check the method(s) or material(s) that are used in the instruction. If the method or material is not listed, please add.

Questionnaire, Part I							
For each type of reasoning and evidence that you teach, please check the method(s) or material(s) that are used in the instruction. If the method or material is not listed, please add.							
TYPES OF REASONING	Categorical Syllogism	Hypothetical Syllogism	Disjunctive Syllogism	Enthymeme	Sign	Generalization	Example
Analogy							
Cause to Effect	Effect to Cause	Effect to Effect	Others	TYPES OF EVIDENCE	FACTS	Statistics	Cases (Example)
Opinions	Circumstantial	SPECIAL TYPES	Literal and Figurative Analogies	Authority	Primary or Original Source	Secondary Source (Indirect)	Others
Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others
PANEL DISCUSSION							
CLASS DISCUSSION							
DEMONSTRATION BY INSTRUCTOR							
DEMONSTRATION BY EXPERIENCED DEBATORS							
STUDY SHEET OUTLINES							
STUDY SHEETS							
ASSIGNED CLASS TEXTBOOK							
LIBRARY OF TEXTBOOKS							
FILM STRIPS							
MOVIES							
SUMMER CLINICS							
LECTURE BY TEACHER							
DEBATE HANDBOOKS							
RESEARCH BY DEBATERS							
GUEST EXPERTS							
OTHERS							

APPENDIX B

Personal Letter and Instruction, the Endorsement, and  
Part II of the Questionnaire

Muskegon Senior High School  
Muskegon, Michigan  
October 30, 1959

Dear Colleague:

I want to thank you for your cooperation on Part I of the survey. At the moment I do not have sufficient returns to draw conclusions, but I am sure that is only a temporary problem.

Enclosed is Part II of the survey. It is necessary to have sufficient returns from both parts before conclusions can be drawn.

The instructions are included on the survey. Please feel free to add or clarify your answers.

Yours truly,

John F. Kirn



MICHIGAN HIGH SCHOOL FORENSIC ASSOCIATION  
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN  
3501 Administration Building  
Ann Arbor, Michigan

September 23, 1959

Dear Debate Coach:

I wish to add my endorsement of the study on the teaching of reasoning and evidence being conducted by one of our fellow debate coaches, Mr. John Kirn.

The results of this undertaking will be significant only if each debate coach carefully completes Mr. Kirn's questionnaire. I urge your cooperation.

Thank you.

Yours sincerely,

Moyne L. Cabbage  
Manager

MLC/ml

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY East Lansing

---

College of Communication Arts - Department of Speech

September 4, 1959

To Whom It May Concern:

I am pleased to endorse the research efforts of Mr. John Kirn and to say that the results of this survey will undoubtedly be of great value to debate coaches throughout Michigan. I know that they will be made available to coaches in all Michigan high schools and will serve to answer some of the persistent problems that one faces in this job. Each individual response will, of course, be important in increasing the reliability of the study. Your co-operation will be most valuable.

Sincerely yours,

Frederick Alexander  
Associate Professor  
Department of Speech  
Michigan State University

FA/jma



11. Do your debaters use an assigned textbook? Yes\_\_\_\_  
No\_\_\_\_

Title\_\_\_\_\_ Author\_\_\_\_\_

12. Do you use film strips? Yes\_\_\_\_ No\_\_\_\_

Title\_\_\_\_\_ Company\_\_\_\_\_

13. Do you use movies? Yes\_\_\_\_ No\_\_\_\_

Title\_\_\_\_\_ Company\_\_\_\_\_

14. Do you use debate handbooks? Yes\_\_\_\_ No\_\_\_\_ If so,  
please rank in order of preference. (In case of tie  
use the same number--#1 is highest) \_\_\_\_\_evidence ab-  
stracts, \_\_\_\_\_strategy, \_\_\_\_\_briefs, \_\_\_\_\_bibliography of  
authorities, or others\_\_\_\_\_

15. Check the handbooks that you use:

Emil Pfister's\_\_\_\_\_  
Mid-West\_\_\_\_\_  
NUEA\_\_\_\_\_  
Reference Shelf\_\_\_\_\_  
Walch\_\_\_\_\_  
Others\_\_\_\_\_

16. Please check the following institutions where your  
debaters attend.

	<u>Fall Clinics</u>	<u>Fall Tournaments</u>	<u>Summer Clinics</u>
Albion	_____	_____	_____
Alma	_____	_____	_____
Central Michigan	_____	_____	_____
Eastern Michigan	_____	_____	_____
Ferris Institute	_____	_____	_____
Michigan State U.	_____	_____	_____
Northern Michigan	_____	_____	_____
U. of Detroit	_____	_____	_____
U. of Michigan	_____	_____	_____
Wayne State U.	_____	_____	_____
Western Michigan	_____	_____	_____
Others	_____	_____	_____

17. Of the total time devoted to training debaters, approx-  
imately what per cent is allotted to the teaching of  
reasoning and evidence?  
25%\_\_\_\_ 50%\_\_\_\_ 75%\_\_\_\_ or \_\_\_\_%.

18. Do your experienced debaters assist in the instruction of reasoning and evidence? Yes\_\_\_ No\_\_\_ How?\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
19. Approximately how much money per year is spent for materials?\_\_\_\_\_
20. Do your debaters have a specific summer debate assignment? Yes\_\_\_ No\_\_\_
21. If so, what is the assignment?\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
22. Is coaching debate your only speech activity? Yes\_\_\_ No\_\_\_
23. What other activities are your responsibility?  
a. Plays: Yes\_\_\_ No\_\_\_ How many?\_\_\_\_\_  
b. Forensic: Yes\_\_\_ No\_\_\_ All Categories? Yes\_\_\_ No\_\_\_  
c. Others:\_\_\_\_\_
24. What size school do you teach in? Circle: A, B, C, D, or E
- \*25. Briefly describe the study sheet outlines that you use in teaching reasoning and evidence.\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
- \*26. Please describe the study sheets that are used in teaching reasoning and evidence.\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
27. How do guest experts assist in teaching reasoning and evidence?\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
28. Briefly describe demonstrations that are used by the coach in teaching reasoning and/or evidence.\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

\*Copies of the study sheets and/or outlines would be of value to the writer.

Just return the questionnaire. Thank you for your co-operation. A copy of the results will be mailed to you in the immediate future.

Sincerely,

John F. Kirn

## APPENDIX C

### Debate Textbooks which the Coaches of this Study Used in Instructing their Debaters

- Crocker, Lionel. Argumentation and Debate. New York: American Book Co., 1944.
- Foster, William T. Argumentation and Debating. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1945.
- Gulley, Halbert E. Essentials of Discussion and Debate. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1955.
- Hedde, Wilhelmina, and Brigrance, W. N. The New American Speech. Chicago: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1957.
- McBurney, James H., O'Neill, James M., and Mills, Glen B. Argumentation and Debate. New York: Macmillan Co., 1951.
- Monroe, Alan H. Principles of Speech. 4th ed. Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Co., 1951.
- Musgrave, George M. Competitive Debate: Rules and Techniques. 3d ed. New York: The H. W. Wilson Co., 1957.
- Pfister, Emil R. Discussion Guidebook for High School Debaters. Mt. Pleasant, Michigan: Central Michigan College Press, 1958.
- Potter, David (ed.). Argumentation and Debate. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1954.
- Quimby, Brooks. So You Want to Discuss and Debate. Portland, Maine: J. Weston Walch, 1954.
- Sattler, William M., and Miller, N. Edd. Discussion and Debate. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Michigan High School Forensic Assoc., 1959.
- Summers, Harrison B. Contest Debating. A Textbook for Beginners. New York: H. W. Wilson Co., 1934.
- Summers, Harrison B., Whan, Forest L., and Rousse, Thomas A. How To Debate. 3d. ed. revised. 1953.

## APPENDIX D

### Motion Pictures which Are Helpful in Preparing Debaters

Below is an annotated bibliography of movies taken from the co-catalog of Michigan State University and the University of Michigan audio-visual aids departments.

How to Judge Authorities (1 reel, 11 min.) Collaborator: William G. Brink, PhD., Professor of Education, Northwestern University. When Bill encounters a puzzling conflict between statements of "authorities," he considers the "internal evidence" on each authority, the experience from which each speaks, and the evidence of his own experience to reach sound decisions. \$50 B & W--\$100 Color. Junior and Senior High.<sup>1</sup>

How to Judge Facts (1 reel, 11 min.) Collaborator: William G. Brink, PhD., Professor of Education, Northwestern University. This film teaches common errors in thinking to show the value of dependable information. It helps students guard against assumptions, false analogies, irrelevant facts, and words with double meaning. \$50 B & W--\$100 Color. Junior and Senior High. \$2.00 MSU-UM.

How to Think (1½ reels, 13½ min.) Collaborator: Carter Davidson, PhD., Chancellor of Union University. A traffic ticket gives Dick cause to do a lot of straight thinking. By following the film's suggested procedure for clear and careful thinking, he is able to solve his problem. The important elements of concentration, logic, observation, memory, imagination, and judgment are all presented as part of the correct "way to think." \$75 B & W--\$137.50 Color. Junior and Senior High. \$2.50 MSU-UM.

Importance of Making Notes (1 reel, 11 min.) Collaborator: Harl R. Douglass, PhD., Director, College of Education,

---

<sup>1</sup>Obtained only from Coronet Films, Coronet Building, 65 E. So. Water Street, Chicago 1, Illinois.



University of Colorado. Students will see how good notes are taken in oral instruction period and during reading. They see how to find the key ideas for notes, what sorts of materials should be taken down verbatim, and when notes should not be taken at all. \$60 B & W--\$110 Color. Junior and Senior High. \$2.00 MSU-UM.

Library Organization (1 reel, 11 min.) Collaborator: Alice Lonrer, Assistant Professor of Library Science, University of Illinois. A detailed understanding of library organization effects better use of study time. By explaining the card catalog system and the Dewey Decimal System in use in one typical library, the film provides students with the means for making their library a treasure of information. \$60 B & W--\$110 Color. Junior, Senior, and College. \$2.00 MSU-UM.

Learn to Argue Effectively (1 reel, 11 min.) Collaborator: William E. Otterback, PhD., Director, Discussion Service, Ohio State University. This film clarifies the role of persuasive argument. It shows when arguments are purposeful, what subjects are good and bad, and what is a basis for a profitable argument. It contrasts the serious use of good argument against that of irrelevant, unsound argument. \$60 B & W--\$110 Color. Junior and Senior High. \$2.00 MSU-UM.

ROOM USE ONLY

~~MAY 16 1962~~

~~MAY 16 1962~~

~~JUL 5 1962~~

~~JUL 24 1962~~

~~JAN 9 1964~~

~~JUL 28 1964~~

~~AUG 2 85~~

~~JUL 31 1966~~

~~AUG 1 1967~~

~~AUG 30 1968~~

~~OCT 23 1970~~

ROOM USE ONLY

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES



3 1293 03142 4991