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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

Since ancient times educational institutions have geared themselves to equipping their students with the necessary knowledge and skills to compete in and contribute to their respective societies. A number of activities were devised to provide exposure for the student to real-life situations. The assumption being, of course, that exposure under the staged conditions would improve the student's chances for success when he was faced with the real thing. Since ancient times one of the most popular and certainly one of the most persistent activities for honing the ability to make critical decisions has been academic debating.

Although debating will probably never replace football or basketball as a participant or spectator activity, its prominence as an educational activity has, for the most part, grown rapidly. The list of educators, businessmen, politicians, and others who ascribe at least a portion of their success to debating is long, impressive, and growing. A debate textbook in popular usage on a number of college campuses claims no less than thirteen enviable values that can be achieved for the individual student through a well-conducted educational debate.
program. Rare indeed is the argumentation or debate text that does not devote at least several pages to the potential growth that the individual can sustain from having participated in this activity.

In recent years, however, academic debating has also compiled a growing list of detractors, many from its own ranks, for having lost sight of the goals for which educational debate was originally conceived. Critics claim that the benefits of academic debate are being supplanted by motivations that are not educationally justifiable. The charges are many and varied, but most often the controversy centers around the debater who puts winning ahead of everything else. One of the most common indictments is that many debaters use evidence in such a way as to be unethical or at least in violation of educationally sound principles.

What is or is not unethical or poor technique in regards to evidence is subject to a wide variety of opinion, and it was not the purpose of this research to add fuel to the heated discussion on the merits of any position. It does seem desirable, nevertheless, that coaches, debaters, judges, and writers of debate texts constantly analyze and re-evaluate contemporary theory and practice of this ancient art if it is to be of maximum value in the mental and moral training of students. This study provides data for analysis and re-evaluation from a new focus of attention, that of textbook theory on the use of evidence and its relationship to successful debate practice.

---

Statement of the Problem

A popular textbook asserted that in the argumentative situation a judge, faced with the decision of whom to believe, will logically believe the debater who does the better job of presenting evidence which establishes the debater's position.\(^2\)

The academic debater soon learns, however, that argumentation per se is not concerned with collecting copious amounts of material called evidence, but rather with utilization and verification of evidence. As Windes and Hastings so acutely observed:

> In short, argumentation is not a content-oriented discipline, such as history and the sciences, but is more accurately a method-oriented discipline. Saying this does not impugn either the importance or the dignity of argumentation. Evidence is of great concern to the advocate, and argumentation teaches him not only its significance, but its use.\(^3\)

Students of argumentation are often advised to improve their skills in locating and presenting evidence by studying and emulating successful debaters. One purpose of this descriptive research project was to discover and describe the sources, types, quantities, and documentation of evidence by successful tournament debaters.

The other and equally important purpose was to compare successful debate practice with contemporary textbook theory on the sources, types, quantities, and documentation of evidence.

---

\(^2\)Freeley, p. 73.

Importance of the Study

Although the analysis of the argumentation textbooks did not yield a unanimity of opinion as to what did or did not constitute evidence, there was unanimous agreement among the books surveyed as to its importance in academic debating. Freeley called evidence "the raw material of argumentation."\(^4\) Kruger remarked similarly that "Evidence is the basis of an argument, the substance from which the inference, or conclusion is derived, the 'proof' of the conclusion (which itself is not directly verifiable), or a reason for believing the conclusion."\(^5\) Capp and Capp summed up the belief of most of the other textbook authors:

...It (evidence) gives support to arguments and serves as a basis for inferences, which relate to the issue through reasoning. The facts and circumstances per se constitute evidence: inferences drawn from the facts and circumstances constitute reasoning. Logical proof, the result of both evidence and reasoning, serves as the foundation upon which the agreement to a proposition rests; it is the conclusion established through evidence and reasoning.\(^6\)

This study represents a relevant move in a series of steps toward empirically testing the relationship between textbook theory and the practice of successful debaters. By understanding in greater detail

\(^4\) Freeley, p. 72.


how successful debaters use evidence, perhaps teachers of debate will be able to test the worth of their suggestions about the use of evidence. The study also makes it possible to reach certain conclusions about the ethical actions of successful debaters—assuming of course, that the textbook suggestions provide the foundation for ethical behavior in academic debating.

The study provides a basis for evaluating textbook theory on how evidence may be classified by type and source. It provides as well, a useful comparison between textbook theory and debater practice with regard to documentation and qualification of sources. Furthermore, it attempts to define the relationship between the types and/or sources of evidence used and the debate topic.

**Research Questions**

In order to achieve the stated objectives, these questions were investigated:

1. What are the sources of evidence commonly described by accepted textbooks in argumentation and debate?

2. What are the types of evidence described by textbooks in argumentation and debate?

3. What suggestions do textbooks in argumentation and debate make about the documentation of evidence?

4. What sources of evidence commonly described by argumentation and debate texts are used most by successful debaters?

5. What types of evidence commonly described by argumentation and debate texts are used most by successful debaters?
6. How thoroughly do successful debaters follow the suggestions of argumentation and debate texts in regards to the documentation of evidence?

7. To what extent is evidence used by successful debaters?

8. What is the relationship (if any) between the type and/or source of evidence used and the proposition being considered?

Review of the Literature

In recent years there has been a considerable amount of material written on evidence that widens both the scope and quantity of research in this area. In 1949, Brittin, in a study of the concept of evidence as viewed by ancient, medieval, and modern rhetoricians, concluded that "evidence, although basic to proof and a significant aspect of invention, had not been previously treated as a research project." Since that time, however, evidence has been considered in some detail both descriptively and experimentally.

A study in 1954 by Gilkinson, Paulson, and Sikkink sought to test experimentally "the relative effectiveness of authority and non-authority presentation on audience attitude shift, retention, and convincingness ratings." The study revealed no significant difference

---


between authority and non-authority presentation on attitude shift, retention, or convincingness ratings. Both authority and non-authority presentations effected a significant shift of attitude in the audience; and although not statistically significant, all differences favored the authority presentation.

Another experimental study conducted by Cathcart in 1955 sought to answer several questions about the use of authoritative evidence. Employing the Woodward Shift of Opinion Ballot, Cathcart tested the relative persuasiveness of a speech on capital punishment by varying the amount of evidence, the documentation of evidence, and qualifications of the source or authority for evidence. Cathcart concluded that a speech supported by evidence was more persuasive than one supported by assertion. He also found, however, that identifying the material as evidence and citing the source was no more persuasive than simply presenting the material.

Dresser tested the relative effectiveness of "satisfactory" and "unsatisfactory" evidence in answering the following questions:

1. Will a speech in which contentions are supported by "satisfactory" evidence be more successful in changing audience attitudes than one in which contentions are supported by "unsatisfactory" evidence?

2. Will different types of "unsatisfactory" evidence differ in their power to change audience attitude?

---

3. If the evidence in a speech fails to meet one of the tests of evidence frequently stated in current texts in argumentation, will audiences notice the shortcoming?

4. Will a speech in which contentions are supported by "satisfactory" evidence obtain a higher audience rating for persuasiveness than a comparable address in which contentions are supported by "unsatisfactory" evidence?¹⁰

Dresser concluded that the quality of the evidence did not significantly affect the power of a speech to influence listener attitudes and that listeners seldom perceive weaknesses in evidence.

Wagner designed a study to "determine the relative effectiveness of using either none, three, six, or nine amounts of well-documented evidence in a persuasive communication."¹¹ Wagner concluded that varying the amount of evidence did not significantly affect the audience acceptance of a speech, and speeches with differing amounts of evidence were equally successful in aiding listeners to retain and comprehend the materials presented.

Research conducted by Delmar Anderson both provided support for and raised questions about previous studies on evidence. He reported, as did others, that the use of authoritative testimony and the qualification of that authority did not aid in the changing of attitudes.


Contrary to some research, however, he concluded that the amount of specific information communicated in a persuasive speech was increased by citing and qualifying the source for that information.  

McKee analyzed the use of evidence in debates at the "Heart of America Tournament" held yearly at the University of Kansas. Ten teams of "distinction" were selected and their use of evidentiary material subjected to a qualitative and quantitative scrutiny. The qualitative portion was concerned with the incidence of evidence, its employment in the structure of the argument, and its relationship to other structural characteristics. In the quantitative evaluation, each piece of evidence was evaluated according to eight criteria: relevancy, consistency, dating the evidence, primary or secondary source, recency of evidence, statistical adequacy.

McKee concluded that:

1. The debaters studied supported their subordinate contentions 96 percent of the time with either evidence or reasoning.

2. The average incidence of evidence for the ten debates studied was forty-two.

---


3. The application of the eight criteria to the evidence employed in the ten debates revealed that the criteria were met fully, 58 percent of the time; partially, 19 percent; and not at all, 23 percent.

Dan Costley sought to test experimentally the relative effectiveness of varying the presentation of quantitative (statistical) evidence in a speech of advocacy. Three versions of a speech were prepared: in the first, quantitative evidence and comparisons to audience experience were included; in the second, only statistics were used; and in the third, generalized statements replaced the quantitative evidence. The speech with quantitative evidence and comparisons to audience experience induced the greatest shift in attitude as measured by the semantic differential, while the speech with no quantitative evidence induced the smallest shift. It is important to note however, that the F-test showed no significant differences in the change of attitude which resulted from the different speeches.

Several studies have been conducted in recent years to test charges that some debaters were guilty of unethical practices or misconduct in their use of evidence. The first of these was conducted by Larson and Griffin.

---


Four debates chosen at random were taped at the 1962 "Heart of America" Tournament held at the University of Kansas. An attempt was made to check the accuracy of the 100 pieces of evidence used in the four debates. Forty-two of the 100 citations could not be found because of inaccurate or incomplete documentation. Of the 59 pieces that were located in their original form, 50 were judged to be "validly represented." Of the remaining eight citations, five were found to be "misrepresented or violated in context," while three were manufactured or quoted from non-existent sources." Six of the sixteen debaters were involved in these violations.

The 1964 National Debate Tournament final round provided the material for a second and basically similar study by Newman and Sanders. The authors were able to check the accuracy of 65 of the 71 pieces of evidentiary material. They reported that three of the 65 citations had been manufactured and that twenty-three others had been misrepresented. Apparently, over one-third of the evidence presented was somehow misused.

As a direct outgrowth of these two studies, Purnell made an in-depth examination of transcripts from the final rounds of the Harvard

---

Debate Tournament, the Heart of America Tournament, and the National Debate Tournament for the years 1965 and 1966. She sought answers to the following questions:

1. What definitions of evidence are offered by argumentation textbooks?
2. Are the definitions offered useful?
3. What tests of evidence are offered by argumentation textbooks?
4. Are tests offered useful?
5. On the basis of the textbook tests, how frequently do debaters misuse evidence?
6. In what ways is evidence misused?
7. How do debaters challenge opposition evidence?
8. Are the challenges accurate?

She concluded that "...the tests of evidence outlined in argumentation texts are so vague and variable as to be of little direct value to debaters or judges." It was also reported that there were 484 errors in the 385 pieces of evidence studied. Most of the errors were concentrated in the citations (documentation) the debaters offered and the representation of authoritative intent. The debaters were generally unable to detect errors in the evidence used by their opponents.

Several studies of evidence used in the West Point Tournament have been carried out. Porter conducted a structural and content analysis.

---

analysis to determine if "significant differences existed between the winning and losing teams with respect to the quantity of words of source documentation, evidence, explanation of evidence, refutation, and case summaries."\(^{18}\)

No significant differences were found to exist between the winning and losing teams with respect to: (1) proportion of teams that were affirmative or negative, (2) proportion of evidence, (3) proportion of explanation of evidence, (4) proportion of refutation, (5) explanation of evidence/evidence ratios, and (6) the first four variables/total ratio in rebuttal. Of significance to winning or losing was the proportion of source documentation to the total number of words and source documentation to evidence.

In a study of refutation techniques used by West Point debaters in four debates, Boren drew a number of conclusions, two of which were of significance to this study.\(^{19}\) He concluded that attacks on evidence were made more frequently than any of the other general methods of refutation and that the most common method of refutation used by winning teams was citing contrary evidence.


In another study, Dresser sought to compare suggestions for the use of evidence given by argumentation texts to the actual use of evidence by debaters in the final rounds at West Point. He analyzed the adequacy of the definition of evidence, the amount and documentation of evidence, qualification of sources, and recency of evidence. The study supported the following conclusions:

1. The definition of evidence offered in recent argumentation texts is too vague to make possible the classification of all supporting material used by debaters as either evidential or non-evidential.

2. Certain criteria for the use of evidence which are generally agreed upon by recent argumentation texts tend to be difficult for a listener to apply.

3. The skilled debaters studied in this investigation were not successful in using a variety of types of evidence; most of the evidence in the debates analyzed consisted of "evidence of opinion."

4. The debaters were comparatively conscientious about indicating the qualifications of their sources, but much less conscientious about showing the recency of their evidence.20

Although it might appear to some that the research on the use of evidence had been exhausted, this study differed significantly from all previous work in the analysis which was applied. It also differed in one or both of the following ways: (1) the debates that were studied, or (2) the time period over which the debates occurred. Even the

study by Dresser on evidence in intercollegiate debating which came the closest to paralleling this research was significantly different.

The first and most obvious difference lies with the debates themselves. Dresser studied the final rounds of the National Debate Tournament from 1952 to 1962. This study commenced with 1961 and concluded with 1966. With the exception of one year (1961) different debaters, arguing different topics, in different years were analyzed.

The most significant deviations occurred in the analysis. Dresser sought to test the adequacy of a definition of evidence (synthesized from six argumentation texts) in differentiating evidentiary from non-evidentiary material. While a "definition" of evidence was important to this study, the focus was on determining the adequacy of textbook suggestions for categorizing "types and sources" of evidence used by successful debaters.

Dresser also formulated from the six textbooks a set of commonly accepted criteria with which to evaluate the use of evidence by student debaters. He used these four criteria:

1. Evidence should be used to support all ideas that are not obviously true or admitted by one's opponents.
2. Evidence should be carefully documented.
3. Evidence should come from reputable, competent sources.
4. Evidence used should be the most recent available.

Criteria (1) and (4) were not relevant to this study; however, criterion (2) required additional scrutiny. This study was also concerned with how debaters documented their evidence, but several
significant distinctions between this study and Dresser's were apparent. In the first place, Dresser made no attempt to explain what the textbooks meant by "careful documentation." He used only gross categories in describing the debaters' attempts at identifying their evidence, and he did not correlate his findings with the textbook expectations for "careful documentation." He attributed a full 43% of the total incidence of evidence to "outside sources" (i.e.--the evidence originated from a source other than the speaker's personal experience, or made its initial appearance in the debate during an earlier speech) and yet no detailed explanation or description was offered of the authorship, point of origin, or nature of this "outside source." Furthermore, he did not correlate even the gross categories with textbook theory on the categorization and documentation of source.

A final distinction between this and the Dresser research was that this study attempted to discover and describe the relationship (if any) between the types and sources of evidence and the debate proposition.

In summation, the Dresser study was primarily evaluative rather than concerned with detailed description and no serious attempt was made to correlate the findings with textbook theory on classifying or evaluating evidence. This study, on the other hand, was primarily descriptive and focused on correlating and comparing successful debate practice with textbook theory on types, sources, documentation, and quantities of evidence in addition to analyzing the relationship between the evidence used and the debate proposition.
Summary

1. This study provides data relevant to teachers of debate and writers of argumentation texts on certain aspects of the use of evidence by successful intercollegiate student debaters.

2. The study had two basic purposes: (A) to discover and describe the sources, types, quantities, and documentation of evidence by successful tournament debaters, and (B) to compare successful debate practice with contemporary textbook theory on the source, types, quantities, and documentation of evidence.

3. The study makes a contribution to intercollegiate forensics by representing a relevant move in a series of steps toward analytically testing the relationship between textbook theory and the practice of successful debaters.

4. In order to achieve the stated objectives, eight research questions about textbook theory and debate practice were formulated and investigated.

5. In reviewing the literature in the field it was found that this study differed significantly from any other previous research in the analysis which was applied, the debates that were studied, and the time period over which the debates occurred.
Organization of the Thesis

The thesis is organized as follows: Chapter One introduces the problem and reviews the literature in the field. Chapter Two describes the methods and procedures. Chapter Three discusses the results of the analysis. Chapter Four is devoted to summarizing and drawing conclusions from the results.
CHAPTER TWO

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

This portion of the study describes in detail the methodology and procedures followed in preparing and carrying out the analysis. This chapter contains information on: the debaters selected for study and the principal sources of data; reliability measures; the textbooks selected for use in the analysis; the definition of evidence; the types of evidence described in the textbooks surveyed; sources of evidence; the documentation and qualification of evidentiary materials; the quantification of evidentiary materials; the quantification of evidence, and; the relationship between evidence and the debate proposition.

Selection of Successful Debaters

Although a number of collegiate tournaments have reputations for attracting "successful" debate teams, nowhere was this more true than at the National Debate Tournament held yearly in April at the United States Military Academy from 1949 until 1966. Teams compiling outstanding debate records were invited to participate in one of eight district run-off tournaments. A total of thirty-four teams were selected from the eight districts and were invited to participate in the National Championships. At the National Tournament, all thirty-four teams plus a team from the previous year's winning school and one from
the U.S. Military Academy were matched for eight preliminary rounds. At the end of the eighth preliminary round, the top sixteen teams were matched in four, single-elimination rounds. The winner of the final round was considered to be the national champion. Newman and Sanders described the selection process this way:

Each April for eighteen years, the "World Series of Debating" has been held at the United States Military Academy. In this tournament, the top college teams in the nation, selected from eight districts, come together for eight preliminary and four final rounds of debate. The winner of the final round is the acknowledged national champion for the year.21

Based on the selection process, the two teams appearing in the final round of debate at the National Debate Tournament were considered by most to be among the most successful collegiate debate teams in the country for any given year. These two teams for the years 1961-1966 were selected for this study. The participating teams, and the propositions debated were:

1961 - Resolved: That the United States Should Adopt a Program of Compulsory Health Insurance for All Citizens.

   Affirmative - Harvard University
   Negative - King's College

1962 - Resolved: That Labor Organizations Should Be under the Jurisdiction of Anti-Trust Legislation.

Affirmative - Baylor University
Negative - Ohio State University

1963 - Resolved: That the Non-Communist Nations of the World Should Establish An Economic Community.

Affirmative - Dartmouth College
Negative - University of Minnesota


Affirmative - Boston College
Negative - University of Pacific

1965 - Resolved: That the Federal Government Should Establish a National Program of Public Work for the Unemployed.

Affirmative - Carson-Newman College
Negative - Northeastern State College


Affirmative - Northwestern University
Negative - Wayne State University

The principal sources of data for the study were the manuscript speeches from the final rounds of the National Debate Tournament. The manuscripts from 1961 through 1966 have been compiled by Windes and Kruger in their book Championship Debating. (Volume II). The manuscripts in this book were transcribed from tape recordings of the final rounds. Each of the speeches was broken down by this researcher in a full content outline to facilitate the identification, classification, and evaluation of the evidentiary material.

---

Once the speeches were broken down into full content outlines, statements which met the definition of "evidentiary material" were singled out by placing an identifying number in the left-hand margin of the outlines. The identifying number indicated the year in which the debate took place, which side the evidence was introduced by, which speech the evidence appeared in, and the chronological order of its appearance. For example, the number 63-1AR-4 meant that the statement was the fourth piece of evidence introduced by the first affirmative rebuttalist in the 1963 debate.

Flow charts that recorded textbook suggestions as to how evidence could be classified and/or rated as to type, source, adequacy of documentation, quantity, etc. were made for each speech. Each piece of evidence was carefully scrutinized and classified and/or rated using the textbook criteria for evaluation in each of the previously mentioned categories. New categories were created and used whenever necessary to classify pieces of evidence that fell beyond the boundaries of textbook description. This last step was taken so that the description and analysis of what was done would be as complete and accurate as possible.

After each piece of evidence had been classified and recorded, master flow charts were prepared so that the data could be reported in terms of totals for all the debates as a collective whole, totals for winning and losing teams, and totals for affirmative and negative teams.
Reliability Measures

In order to insure a reasonable measure of reliability in the analysis of the debates, these measures were taken: (1) All of the evidence in a randomly selected speech from the debates under study was classified by a collegiate debate coach with considerable experience in this area. This independent judge used the flow charts described earlier and the methods and procedures chapter of this study as a guide. The findings of this judge were then compared with the findings of the author. (2) Ten days after the initial analysis one-third of the total evidence introduced into the debates was re-analyzed by the author and compared with the previous findings. Although these checks revealed several minor discrepancies, none were of such a nature or in sufficient quantity to compromise the integrity of the data or to affect the conclusions drawn from the data.

Textbook Selection

Thirteen leading textbooks in argumentation and debate were reviewed. These thirteen books were selected from all 35 books listed in the Subject Guide to Books in Print under the heading "debate--

23 A listing of the textbooks surveyed may be found in Appendix A.
argumentation" and related areas. Twelve books were eliminated as being non-pertinent inasmuch as they were designed for discussion, salesmanship, or some like area. Another ten books were eliminated because they were paperbacks that treated evidence with insufficient detail to be applicable to the study.

Of the books that were selected, newer editions or revisions of the same book were not considered as another entry. It was assumed that textbooks from 1950 to the present were reflective of contemporary "theory" on the use of evidence in intercollegiate debating.

The categories and suggestions of each book that were pertinent to source, type, and documentation of evidence were recorded. After each book had been surveyed, a synthesis was made to chart common characteristics. Atypical categories or suggestions were also charted and used for evaluation if they were clearly justified and explained by the author. From this process a set of commonly accepted textbook criteria with which to evaluate the use of evidence by the debaters was constructed.

Evidence: Definition

Definition

One of the first pre-analysis tasks was the construction of a

definition of evidence to facilitate the distinguishing of evidentiary from non-evidentiary material. Since much of the theory and practice in academic debate was derived from legal debate, it seemed reasonable to turn first to a juristic definition of evidence before consulting the debate textbooks. Black defined evidence as:

Any species of proof or probative matter, legally presented at the trial of an issue, by the act of the parties and through the medium of witnesses, records, documents, concrete objects, etc., for the purpose of inducing belief in the minds of the court or jury as to their contentions.25

Although this definition has served the law courts admirably for a number of years, it had limited usefulness for this study. In academic debate a principle of some sort, rather than a person, is on trial. Rarely, if ever, is there occasion for live witnesses or for the introduction of material objects, and no need is apparent for stringent rules on the admissibility of evidence such as prevail in the law courts. The differences that were apparent between academic and legal debate were reflected in definitions of evidence offered by the argumentation textbooks. Ehninger and Brockriede suggested this definition:

Evidence may be described initially as the information to which proof appeals, the factual foundation on which it rests, the terminus from which it starts. No unit of proof

is possible without data, there is no accepted ground to which a claim may be referred.26

At a later point Ehninger and Brockriede concluded:

Evidence may be defined, then as an informative statement believed by the listener or reader and employed by an arguer to secure belief in another statement. As the preceding discussion indicates, evidence may range from highly specific statements of statistical compilation, description, direct quotation, or narrative, to far more generalized statements that have previously been certified by means of prior proofs. Always, however, evidence answers the questions, "How do you know?" "What have you got to go on?"27

Freeley suggested that "Evidence is the raw material of argumentation. It consists of facts, opinions, and objects that are used to generate proof. The advocate brings together the raw materials and, by the process of reasoning, produces new conclusions."28 Huber claimed that "evidence is any matter of fact used in gaining the belief or changing attitudes of others."29

McBurney and Mills maintained:

Evidence consists of facts, opinions (Ordinary and expert), and material things that are used in generating proof. It is the raw material from which the finished product, proof, is made by the process of reasoning. Evidence


27Ehninger and Brockriede, pp. 100-101.

28Freeley, p. 72.

differs from reasoning, which is the other ingredient of proof, in that evidence is independent of and external to the advocate. In other words, the advocate finds evidence, but develops the reasoning.30

Mills offered a useful explanation when he described evidence as "factual statements, objects not created by the advocate which are offered in support of his claims. Factual statements or empirical data consist of presumably verifiable information on the occurrence, existence, classification, or character of phenomena."31

Capp and Capp concurred with Mills that evidence consists of factual material or opinion used to prove a contention.32 They further categorized evidence as being either fact (Statistics, examples, etc.) or opinion (statement of belief).33

Kruger claimed that evidence "is the basis of an argument, the substance from which the inference, or conclusion, is derived, the 'proof' of the conclusion...or a reason for believing the conclusion."34 He, like many other authors, categorized evidence as empirical or authoritative.


32 Capp and Capp, p. 102.

33 Capp and Capp, p. 105.

34 Kruger, p. 132.
Windes and Hastings maintained that evidence is:

"That form of argumentative proof which deals with facts and opinions as to fact." All evidence stems from observation of fact, opinion involves one's interpretation of fact, its assimilation, and a resulting conclusion. By "fact" we mean admitted realities. By "opinion" we mean judgment concerning the existence of a fact, a belief about a fact, the interpretation of a fact, or a conclusion about a fact.35

An abstract of similarities from these definitions revealed three characteristics in common: (1) Evidence is information used to generate proof. (2) Evidence consists of facts, opinions, and objects. (3) Evidence exists outside the speaker and must be believed by the audience.

Operational definition

Counted as evidence in this study was any informative statement (fact or opinion) used to support a speaker's argument. Statements not enclosed in quotation marks or attributed to a specific source were included as well as statements obviously quoted or clearly documented.

This operational definition of necessity took exception with several of the textbooks on how evidentiary should be distinguished from non-evidentiary material. To determine whether or not the audience "believed" the evidence would have imposed an impossible and irrelevant task on this study. Furthermore, the insistence that evidence

35 Windes and Hastings, pp. 97-98.
must exist "outside" the speaker would have rendered it impossible to classify informative statements drawn from the speaker's personal experience or information that was presented by "judicial notice." However, any statement that did not meet the textbook definition was clearly identified as "speaker's personal experience," "judicial notice," or some other appropriate category.

**Types of Evidence**

The textbooks surveyed revealed a wide latitude of opinion as to how the "types" of evidence should be categorized. Some authors categorized evidence by its relation to the conclusion, others used the legal distinctions, and still others employed the reasoning pattern used in its (evidence) presentation or development. Paul Brandes described this problem nicely when he observed:

> Anyone who attempts to categorize the forms of evidence risks making the same error that T.S. Eliot avoided when he would not define poetry because he knew of no definition which either did not assume that the reader already knew what poetry meant or which left out more poetry than it included.36

The difficulties in preparing a representative synthesis were compounded by the fact that many authors used different labels for

---

basically the same sorts of things. By disregarding labels and focusing on author description, two somewhat gross categories emerged: facts and opinions. A number of frequently mentioned categories were eliminated as being impossible to apply or irrelevant in the academic debating situation.

Typical of those categories eliminated for classifying the type and/or source of evidence are:

1. Witnesses. The speaker who furnishes a written statement is furnishing a document rather than employing a witness who may be cross-examined.

2. Material objects. Academic debaters rarely, if ever, introduce real objects as evidence. Furthermore, this study was concerned only with evidence introduced orally and manifested in the transcripts of the debates.

3. Deliberate or casual. The listeners have no way of judging whether the opinion given was "off the cuff" or for the record.

4. Original or hearsay. (Primary or secondary). It was not the purpose of this study to determine whether the debater used the best available evidence.

Ehninger and Brockriede maintained that evidence could be typed one way as being either "original" or "hearsay" i.e., original evidence consists of reports based on firsthand observation or experience, while hearsay evidence is evidence that has been told to the reporter by someone else (p. 111). Freeley offered a similar description but labeled the categories as being either primary or secondary. Confusion over different labels but similar descriptions and vice versa was commonplace.
5. *Direct or circumstantial.* To determine the relationship of the evidence to the conclusion was more properly left to a study investigating the reasoning or arguments of tournament debaters.

As mentioned, the most commonly agreed upon "types" of evidence were facts and opinions. A summary of this portion of the analysis may be found in Table I.

Facts

Bauer explained a fact this way:

The term fact is somewhat difficult to define, but it normally refers to objective statements and empirically verifiable data. For example: "Three-fourths of the students in our university are pro-Republican." "Many of the rivers and lakes in the United States are no longer safe for swimming because of industrial pollution." Such "facts" can be subjected to various kinds of tests to check their correctness...38

Brembeck and Howell, 39 McBurney and Mills, 40 and most of the others concluded that fact evidence consists of presumably verifiable statements where both the reporting and the existence of information can be "checked on."


39 Brembeck and Howell, p. 189.

40 McBurney and Mills, pp. 91-92.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUTHORS</th>
<th>FACT</th>
<th>OPINION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baird</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bauer</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandes</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brembeck and Howell</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capp and Capp</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ehninger and Brockriede</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huber</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kruger</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McBurney and Mills</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mills</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moulton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windes and Hastings</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Opinion

Generally speaking, the texts defined opinion evidence as statements made by witnesses based on their judgment or belief as to the existence or interpretation of a fact.

Special Function Classes

As noted earlier, several of the textbook authors chose to classify evidence by certain functions it served or by the reasoning process involved in its presentation or development. Two atypical categories for classifying evidence by special function class were included by Freeley. They included evidence introduced by judicial notice and evidence aliunde. Both of these are terms borrowed from the law courts and were explained as follows:

Judicial notice: Judicial notice is the process whereby certain evidence may be introduced without the necessity of substantiating...Certain matters, which we might reasonably expect any well informed layman to know, may be presented as evidence simply by referring to them.41

Evidence aliunde: Also known as "Extraneous" or "Administr- lular" evidence, is evidence used to explain or clarify other evidence. Often the meaning or significance of evidence is not apparent upon the presentation of the evidence per se; therefore, that evidence must be explained by the presentation of other evidence.42

41 Freeley, p. 74.
42 Freeley, p. 86.
Presentational Classes

Some of the textbook authors suggested categories for classifying evidence that seemed to be a manner of presenting evidence rather than a "type" of evidence per se. Included in this group were such categories as "specific factual statement," "factual generalization," "analogy," "example," "opinion statement," and "statistics." Although it may seem redundant to classify the "types" of evidence by the manner in which they were presented, it should be noted that a fact or opinion may be introduced in any one or more of the previously listed presentational classes. Furthermore, these categories provided an additional descriptive device for reporting the practices of the debaters under study. A summary of this portion of the analysis may be found in Table II.

These categories (types, functional class, presentational class) for the classification of evidence were not intended to be exclusive. This study was concerned with reporting in reasonable detail the type or source of evidence used by the debaters. Hence, any new categories that appeared in debater practice that were not suggested in the textbook theory were duly reported, analyzed, and explained.

Sources of Evidence

Generally speaking, in the courts of law, the source or origin of all evidence is either a person (witness testifying in the flesh), a
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRESENTATIONAL CLASS</th>
<th>AUTHORS</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specific Factual Statement</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factual Generalization</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analogy</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opinion Statement</td>
<td>* **</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistics</td>
<td>*** ** *</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
written statement, or a thing (material object). In academic debating, however, by far the most common source of evidence is a written statement. Brandes explained that traditionally a witness gives testimony under observation by the audience (or judge), allowing for the possibility of cross-examination. Therefore, a speaker who furnishes a deposition (or written statement) of an observation of a witness is furnishing a document rather than employing a witness. Moulton corroborated the opinion of Brandes when he noted "...in academic debate, however, almost all evidence is obtained from writings of various kinds, and 'testimony' is essentially written opinion on record from qualified persons." Hence, live witnesses and real objects were not considered for classification in this study; only written statements presented in the debates were analyzed, categorized, and reported.

The textbooks surveyed made suggestions only for the classification of evidence that was newly introduced into the debate and had as its point of origin a written outside source. No provision was made for reference made to evidence introduced in an earlier speech. The suggestions for categorizing sources were most often found in chapters on researching for evidence and not as part of the book devoted to the use of evidence. The written sources commonly described by the textbooks were:


44 Moulton, p. 75.
A. Public records - documents compiled or issued by or with the approval of the government.

B. Book

C. Professional journal

D. Popular journal

E. Newspaper

F. Debate Handbook

G. Interview

H. Personal experience

I. Pamphlet

Every effort was made to completely and accurately describe the written sources used by debaters whether the practice agreed with textbook theory or not. New categories used to describe what was done were created and used in the analysis. A summary of the textbook classifications of evidence by its source may be found in Table III.

**Documentation**

**Definition**

For the purposes of the study, documentation was a statement of the source materials of the evidence in a speech.
TABLE III

EVIDENCE CLASSIFIED BY SOURCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>AUTHORS</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Records</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Journal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popular Journal</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debate Handbook</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Experience</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamphlets</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Baird, Bauer, Brandes, Brembeck and Howell, Capp and Capp, Ehninger and Brockriede, Freeley, Huber, Kruger, McBurney and Mills, Mills, Moulton, Windes and Hastings
Ehninger and Brockriede made clear the importance of documentation with the statement:

Evidence becomes stronger in proportion as its source is stated specifically....vague citations leave room for doubt in the mind of the listener or reader and, therefore, do not give data as much weight as they deserve in the making of critical choices and judgments.45

McBurney and Mills were even more emphatic in stressing the importance of documentation:

When evidence is important, it should be authenticated. Listeners and readers have a right to know enough about the evidence to enable them to check it if they so desire. There is great potential mischief in undocumented evidence. For instance, in legislative hearings, documents are sometimes referred to when there is no opportunity to determine whether they even exist or whether they contain what a witness says they contain. Much damage may result, even though the evidence may have been ruled inadmissible after it was given.46

Mills observed that "Listeners and readers have the right to know the date and source of any evidence offered in support of a claim on their belief. Ideally, the documentation should be such as to enable an interested person to authenticate the evidence if he so desired."47

Ehninger and Brockriede maintained that underlying all the rules for the presentation of evidence in critical deliberation is this basic test.

45Ehninger and Brockriede, pp. 120-121.

46McBurney and Mills, p. 110.

47Mills, p. 113-114.
Is the evidence set forth in such a way that the reader or listener is able to assign it exactly the weight it deserves—no more and no less? When this question can be answered affirmatively, the evidence has been presented in an acceptable manner; when it must be answered negatively, the presentation has in some respect failed to meet the standard that a reader or auditor has the right to expect.48

The assessment of evidence documentation in this study was conducted on a simple four-point scale. If the debater cited the author, the author's qualification, title of the book or article, date and page, he was judged as having met the criteria fully and was given a rating of "one." If he gave less than a full citation, but enough that one could locate the source with reasonable ease, he was judged as having met the criteria partially and was given a rating of "two." If some attempt was made to identify the source, but not enough information was given to be able to locate it with reasonable ease, the debater was judged as having met the criteria incompletely and was given a rating of "three." If no attempt was made to identify the source, or insufficient information was given to be able to locate the source, then the debater was judged as having met the criteria not at all and was given a rating of "four."

In addition to the four-point scale assessment of evidence documentation, record was also kept on how often the debaters cited author, title, date, and page numbers when documenting evidence. Every textbook surveyed with a chapter on researching for evidence suggested

48Ehninger and Brockriede, p. 116.
careful records be kept on the author, the author's qualifications, title of the book or article, the date, and page numbers of each piece of evidence selected for use by the debaters. Textbook author opinion was mixed on how much of this information should be included with the documentation of each piece of evidence used in a debate.

Source qualification

There was general agreement among the texts surveyed that as part of the citation of source one should explain the qualifications of the individual(s) making the statement. Typical of most of the textbook authors was this reaction from Ehninger and Brockriede:

In college debating and elsewhere the support for the warrant of an authoritative proof is quite important. All too often a college debater will support a contention with a few "quotes" from "noted authorities," without taking the trouble to inform his listeners of the qualifications that make the opinions and information of his experts worth believing. Such a debater might as well attribute the statements to himself. Unless an authoritative warrant is supported adequately, no proof exists at all. For it is the warrant certifying the credibility of the source that carries testimonial evidence to the status of a claim.

A preliminary examination of the manuscripts soon revealed that the debaters seldom, if ever, referred to a long list of credentials when qualifying a source. By far the most common practice was to simply qualify experts by association with a well-known, presumably reputable institution or group. Still other experts were "qualified"

\[49\] Ehninger and Brockriede, p. 160.
simply by virtue of an office they held. As a result, this study simply described what was done to qualify sources rather than attempt to make a judgment about how well certain textbook criteria were met. These categories were used in classifying how debaters qualified their sources:

Sources Qualified:

A. Institutional affiliation  
B. Professional or academic degree  
C. Other

Sources Not Qualified:

A. Source nationally known  
B. Source a government agency  
C. Source a private organization  
D. Debater  
E. Source previously introduced  
F. Source not given  
G. Other

**Evidence Classification Procedure**

Only evidence introduced into the debates for the first time was classified by type, function class, presentational class or source. Also classified were pieces of evidence (statements) that were intro-

50 Several of these categories were adapted from the Dresser study on evidence in intercollegiate debating.
duced for the first time in the debate, but had for a written point of origin a source that had already been introduced.

When classifying and rating the documentation and qualification of evidentiary sources only evidence introduced for the first time in the debates was examined. A new statement from a source whose written point of origin had been previously introduced was not rated or classified in terms of documentation or qualification of evidentiary sources.

Quantification of Evidence

Most of the texts made no mention of how much evidence should be used and those that did remarked only in the most general terms. Typical of the advice offered was this statement from Mills:

Sufficiency of evidence is such a variable test that only a few, broad comments can be made about it. Some claims are acceptable and still others require an abundance of evidence. Then too, the quality of evidence is more important than mere quantity. Let it suffice to generalize that multiple sources tend to be better than single ones, that the selection ought to be representative, and that "card stacking" should be avoided.51

Unable to construct criteria for evaluating the quantity of evidence used, only the total incidence of evidence for individual rounds was reported.

51 Mills, p. 109.
Evidence and the Debate Proposition

None of the texts surveyed contained an explicit discussion about a possible relationship between the evidence used and the debate proposition. This being the case, it was necessary to construct categories by which the six debate propositions could be classified. The categories used and propositions were:

1961 - Resolved: That the United States Should Adopt a Program of Compulsory Health Insurance for All Citizens. (Social-welfare)

1962 - Resolved: That Labor Organizations Should Be Under the Jurisdiction of Anti-trust Legislation. (Legal)

1963 - Resolved: That the Non-Communist Nations of the World Should Establish an Economic Community. (International-economic)

1964 - Resolved: That the Federal Government Should Guarantee an Opportunity for Higher Education to All Qualified High School Graduates. (Education)

1965 - Resolved: That the Federal Government Should Establish a National Program of Public Work for the Unemployed. (Social-welfare)


For the purposes of this study, special note was made of differences that occurred in the type and/or source of evidence used by the debaters in considering the previously mentioned propositions. All differences were analyzed and reported.
Summary

1. The final rounds of the National Debate Tournament for 1961 through 1966 were selected for study. These teams were selected not only because they were supposedly the best in the country, but also because the final rounds were tape recorded and transcripts were published.

2. Thirteen leading textbooks in argumentation and debate were reviewed, their categories and suggestions on evidence recorded, synthesized and used in the analysis.

3. Counted as evidence in this study was any informative statement (fact or opinion) used to support a speaker's argument. Statements not enclosed in quotation marks or attributed to a specific source were included as well as statements obviously quoted or clearly documented.

4. The most commonly agreed upon "types" of evidence were facts and opinions. Special functional and presentational classes were developed to assist in describing the "types" of evidence used by the debaters.

5. In academic debating the most common "source" of evidence is a written statement. The most commonly agreed upon written "sources" of evidence included: public records, books, professional and popular journals, newspapers, debate handbooks, interviews, personal experience, and pamphlets.
6. For the purposes of this study, documentation was a statement of the source materials of the evidence in a speech. The adequacy of source documentation was rated on a four-point scale, but because the debaters seldom referred to a list of credentials when qualifying a source, this study simply described what was done to qualify sources rather than attempt to make a judgment about how well certain textbook criteria were met.

7. Only evidence introduced into the debates for the first time, or; evidence introduced for the first time, but having for a written point of origin a source that had already been introduced; was classified by type, function class, presentational class, or source. Ratings or classifications on the documentation or qualification of evidentiary sources were limited to evidence that was introduced into the debates for the first time.

8. Unable to construct criteria for evaluating the quantity of evidence used, only the total incidence of evidence for individual rounds was reported.

9. Because none of the texts surveyed contained an explicit discussion about a possible relationship between the evidence used and the debate proposition, it was necessary to construct categories by which the six debate propositions could be classified.
CHAPTER THREE

RESULTS OF THE ANALYSIS

This chapter contains a report of the findings for the six debates that were studied. Each section is reported in terms of combined totals for all debates, totals for winning and losing teams, and totals for affirmative and negative teams. Findings are reported on debater practice in these areas: types of evidence used; special functional and presentational classes used; the sources of evidence used; the documentation and qualification of evidentiary materials; the quantities of evidence used, and; the relationship between the evidence used (type and/or source) and the debate proposition; and, a discussion of the findings.

Types of Evidence

Textbook theory suggested that evidence could be classified by type into facts and opinions. However, to accurately describe debater practice, a third and fourth major category were established. The third category was designated as fact-opinion and included statements that could not be clearly classified as fact or opinion or statements that contained an element of both fact and opinion. A fourth category, debater assertion, was established and used to classify statements made by the debaters themselves for which no source was given.
Representative of the statements classified as *fact-opinion* was this piece of evidence cited in the first negative rebuttal speech in the 1961 debate:

Perhaps this is the reason that Dr. Jerome B. Cohen of the City College of New York concluded in his 1958 book, *Decade of Decision*: "As comprehensive is now written under group plans it is within the financial reach of even the modest income employee."

Typical of the statements classified as *debater assertion* was this piece of evidence cited in the first affirmative constructive speech in the 1962 debate.

Since 1932, U.S. Policy in applying Anti-Trust to labor has been predicated upon the supposition that the legitimate functions of labor unions must be safe-guarded at all costs.

**Total for all debates**

The debaters used a total of 390 pieces of new evidence. Facts were used 181 times; *opinion* statements accounted for 158 citations; *fact-opinion* for 19; and *debater assertion* for 32 citations.

**Winning and losing teams**

Winning teams cited 200 pieces of new evidence. Facts were used 90 times; *opinion* statements accounted for 93 citations; *fact-opinion* for 7; and *debater assertion* was employed 10 times.

---

52 The 390 pieces of evidence represent the total incidence of evidence introduced into the debates for the first time. Also included in this total were pieces of evidence (statements) that were introduced for the first time in the debate, but had for a written point of origin a source that had already been introduced. Statements that had been previously introduced were not considered new evidence and were not classified again. Hereafter, *new* evidence indicates pieces of evidence that were introduced for the first time.
Losing teams used 190 pieces of new evidence. Facts were used 91 times; opinion statements were cited 65 times; fact-opinion 12 times; and debater assertion was employed 22 times.

Affirmative and negative teams

Affirmative teams used a total of 232 new pieces of evidence. Facts were used 91 times. Opinions were cited 112 times; fact-opinion 11 times; and debater assertions were used 18 times.

Negative teams cited a total of 158 pieces of new evidence. Facts were used 90 times. Opinions were cited 46 times; fact-opinion 8 times; and debater assertion 14 times.

Generally speaking, affirmative teams cited almost one-third more new evidence than did the negative teams. Affirmative teams relied largely on opinion statements using opinions 48.3 percent of the time and fact 38.4 percent.

Negative teams relied largely on factual statements using facts 57 percent of the time and opinions 29.1 percent. A summary of the results for "types" of evidence may be found in Table IV.

Special Function Classes

As the analysis proceeded, three new categories for special function classes were established to supplement judicial notice and alibi which were suggested by the textbooks surveyed. The new categories included: quotation—statements made by famous persons used
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Incidence</th>
<th>Facts</th>
<th>Opinions</th>
<th>Debater</th>
<th>Assertion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>390</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>46.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>93</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>47.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>38.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.86</td>
<td>57.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals for all debates

Percentage

Winning teams

Percentage

Losing teams

Percentage

Affirmative teams

Percentage

Negative teams

Percentage
for introductory or transitional purposes; definition—statements used to define or explain terms or concepts used in the debate; summary—statements that summarized or synthesized evidence that was being, or had been introduced. Statements that served the normal evidentiary function of generating proof were not considered as a special function class. However, statements that did not fall into one of the previously mentioned special function classes were classified as proof. As might be expected, ten percent or less of the total of new evidence cited in the debates fell into one of the special function classes.

A good example of the use of quotation was found in the first affirmative constructive speech in the 1963 debate:

"Two out of every three people alive today eke out a mortal existence struggling against the four malignant curses of our time: hunger, poverty, ignorance, and chronic ill health. For two billion of the world's three billion people, the spectral horsemen pervade the environment of daily life." These are the words of Paul C. Hoffman, Director of the United Nations Special Fund and he's talking about the underdeveloped countries.

Typical of the definition statements was this piece of evidence cited in the first affirmative constructive speech of the 1965 debate:

For the purposes of clarity, we used Dr. Abba Lerner's definition of deflationary unemployment. In his book, Economics of Employment, he describes "deflationary unemployment as that which results from too small a demand for workers.

The first affirmative constructive speech of the 1962 debate supplied this example of a summary statement:
unions can be prosecuted under the Anti-Trust Laws in only three instances: when their acts involve fraud or violence, when they act in collusion with business groups, and when their acts lie outside of the legitimate functions of a labor union, as for example, when they are not involved in a labor dispute as defined by the Norris-LaGuardia Act.

**Total for all debates**

There were 390 pieces of new evidence categorized in the special function classes. *Quotations* were used 5 times; *aliunde* 3 times; *definitions* 22 times; *judicial notice* 7 times; and *summary* 7 times. The most commonly used special function class was *definition*, with slightly more than 5 percent of the total. However, this should not be considered a general pattern since 12 of the 22 examples of *definition* were found in a single debate.

**Winning and losing teams**

The winning teams cited a total of 200 pieces of new evidence. *Quotations* were used 2 times; *aliunde* was used only 1 time; *definitions* 10 times; *judicial notice* 3 times; and *summary* 4 times. *Definition* was the most commonly used special function class with 5 percent of the total.

Losing teams employed a total of 190 new pieces of evidence. The pattern for special function classes closely resembled that of the winners with *quotations* being used 3 times; *aliunde* 2 times; *definitions* 12 times; *judicial notice* 4 times; and *summary* 3 times. Following the now familiar pattern, *definitions* led all special function classes with more than 6 percent of the total.
Affirmative and negative teams

Affirmative teams introduced a total of 232 pieces of new evidence. Quotations were used 3 times; aliunde 2 times; definition 12 times; judicial notice was not used; and summary was used 6 times.

Negative teams introduced a total of 158 pieces of new evidence. Quotations were used 2 times; aliunde 1 time; definition 10 times; judicial notice 7 times; and summary 1 time.

Definitions led all special function classes for both affirmative and negative teams by accounting for 5.2 percent of the total amount of affirmative evidence and 6.33 percent of the total of negative evidence. A summary of the results for special function classes may be found in Table V.

Presentational Classes

Two new categories were added to those suggested by the textbooks in order to categorize the types of evidence used by their presentational classes. In addition to specific factual statement, factual generalization, opinion statement, analogy, example, and statistics, these new categories were created: value statement—an opinion statement concerned with the desirability or undesirability of some course of action; combination—any statement that cannot be clearly classified as one of the preceding presentational classes or statements that contained an element of more than one presentational class.
### TABLE V

**SUMMARY OF RESULTS FOR EVIDENCE CLASSIFIED BY SPECIAL FUNCTION CLASS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Totals for all debates</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Winning teams</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Losing teams</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Affirmative teams</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Negative teams</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quotation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aliunde</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.769</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.31</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial Notice</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proof</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>88.7</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>87.3</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>90.1</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>86.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Incidence</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The second affirmative rebuttal of the 1962 debate provided an example of a value statement:

As Douglas B. Brown of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology pointed out, in an address delivered to the American Bar Association in 1955: "The broad philosophy of the Sherman Act, however, should and must deal with monopoly power, whether it be manifested in combinations of employers or in combinations of unions. In either instance it is the free economy of the nation, not merely relations between employers and employees, which is threatened or adversely affected."

Typical of the evidence classified as combination was this statement from the first negative constructive speech in 1964 debate:

But, looking to Fortune magazine, we find "there is increasing recognition that the corporation profits tax is the most equitable way in which industry can help finance the public services it requires. As a result, the tax has won converts in the corporations themselves and in the legislatures."

Two things are noteworthy about the results of the presentational classes: (1) statements were classified by the manner in which they were presented and not by type, (2) although it was suggested in textbook theory, no examples of evidence presented in analogical form were found in the six debates studied.

Total for all debates

As a collective group, the debaters cited 390 new pieces of evidence. Specific factual statements were used 65 times; factual generalizations 77 times; examples 26 times; value statements 18 times; statistics 34 times; opinion statements 136 times; and combination 34 times.
Opinion statements led all other presentational classes with 34.9 percent of the total followed by factual generalization with 19.7 percent and specific factual statements with 16.4 percent.

Winning and losing teams

Winning teams used a total of 200 new pieces of evidence. Specific factual statements accounted for 32 citations; factual generalizations were used 42 times; examples 10 times; value statements 6 times; statistics 13 times; opinion statements 81 times; and combination 16 times.

Opinion statements led all other presentational classes for winning teams with 40.5 percent of the total. This category was followed by factual generalization with 21 percent and specific factual statements with 16 percent.

Losing teams used a total of 190 new pieces of evidence. Specific factual statements were used 33 times; factual generalizations 35 times; examples 16 times; value statements 12 times; statistics 21 times; opinion statements 55 times; and combination 18 times.

Opinion statements led all other presentational classes for losing teams with 28.9 percent of the total followed by factual generalization with 18.4 percent and specific factual statements with 17.3 percent.
Affirmative and negative teams

Affirmative teams cited a total of 232 new pieces of evidence. Specific factual statements were used 29 times; factual generalizations were used 46 times; examples 14 times; value statements 12 times; statistics 13 times; opinion statements 98 times; and combination 20 times.

Opinion statements led all other presentational classes for affirmative teams with 42.2 percent of the total followed by factual generalizations with 19.8 percent and specific factual statements with 12.5 percent.

Negative teams used a total of 158 new pieces of evidence. Specific factual statements were used 36 times; factual generalizations 31 times; examples 12 times; value statements 6 times; statistics 21 times; opinion statements 38 times; and combination 14 times.

Opinion statements followed the earlier pattern by leading all presentational classes for negative teams with 24.1 percent of the total. In second place and breaking the earlier pattern were specific factual statements with 22.8 percent of the total, followed by factual generalizations with 19.6 percent.

A summary of the results for presentational classes may be found in Table VI.
### TABLE VI

**SUMMARY OF RESULTS FOR EVIDENCE CLASSIFIED BY PRESENTATIONAL CLASS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Totals for all debates</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Winning teams</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Losing teams</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Affirmative teams</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Negative teams</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specific Factual Statement</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factual Generalization</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8.42</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value Statement</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.31</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistics</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8.71</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opinion Statement</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8.71</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9.47</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8.62</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Incidence</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** No examples of evidence presented in analogical form were found in the six debates studied.
Source of Evidence

Textbook theory suggested nine categories for the classification of evidence by its written point of origin: public records, newspapers, professional journals, popular journals, handbooks, personal experience, pamphlets, interviews, and books. Three new categories were established to describe debater practice: court holdings—provisions of law or opinions handed down by the courts of the United States; unclassified—statements that could not be clearly classified by the author in one of the preceding categories; and, unknown—statements for which no source was given. Statements originating by judicial notice or debater assertion were also noted and reported.

The second affirmative constructive speech of the 1962 debate furnished a statement typical of those classified as having originated from a court holding:

I would refer you instead, however, to the case of Alpha Beta Food Markets v Meat Cutters Union, 1956, U.S. Supreme Court, the precedent for the Chicago Board of Trade case. Where the primary purpose of the provision in a union contract is to restrain trade, when the direct intent of the union is to restrain trade in the product market, it is already covered by Anti-Trust legislation.

Representative of the statements in the unclassified category was this statement from the first affirmative constructive speech in the 1965 debate:

Nationally, the Council of Economic Advisers puts the loss into dollars and cents when they reported: "The annual loss of goods and services which results from a difference
of 1½% unemployment, above the level of frictional full employment, is estimated to lie between 30 and 40 billion dollars."

A good deal of the evidence cited had to be classified as unknown because no written point of origin was cited. Typical of the evidence placed in this category was this statement from the first negative constructive speech in the 1966 debate:

In 1963, the Attorney General reported: "Internal Revenue Service figures further indicate a decline in illegal gambling. Gamblers across the country reported accepting bets of fifty-three million dollars, and this represented a 20% drop from fiscal year 1962."

Although interview was suggested as a category by the textbooks surveyed there were no examples found in the six debates studied.

No attempt was made to classify by written point of origin any evidentiary material that had been previously identified in the debate. This measure was taken to prevent classifying the same evidence more than once. There were 85 pieces of evidence used where both the statement and its written point of origin had been previously introduced. There were an additional 35 pieces of evidence used where a new statement was attributed to a written point of origin that had been previously introduced. None of these 120 pieces of evidence were again classified by their written point of origin—to have done so would have been redundant.53

53 The 35 new statements with a written point of origin that had been previously introduced were classified as to type, special function class, and presentational class, but were not classified by written point of origin, source documentation or qualification.
Total for all debates

There were 355 pieces of evidence used where the written point of origin could have been cited by the debaters. Public records were used 36 times; newspapers 12 times; professional journals 16 times; popular journals 25 times; handbooks 2 times; personal experience 2 times; pamphlets 11 times; books 63 times; court holdings 12 times; unclassified 20 times; unknown 118 times; debater assertion 32 times; and judicial notice 7 times.

Unknown led all categories for the written point of origin with 33.2 percent of the total followed by books with 17.8 percent.

Winning and losing teams

Winning teams used 185 pieces of evidence where the written point of origin could have been cited. Public records were used 12 times; newspapers 7 times; professional journals 11 times; popular journals 12 times; handbooks 2 times; personal experience 1 time; pamphlets 3 times; books 29 times; court holdings 4 times; unclassified 13 times; unknown 79 times; debater assertions 10 times; and judicial notice 3 times.

Unknown led all categories for winning teams in the written point of origin with 42.7 percent of the total, followed by books with 15.7 percent.

Losing teams used 170 pieces of evidence where the written point of origin could have been given. Public records were used 24 times;
newspapers 5 times; professional journals 5 times; popular journals 13 times; personal experience 1 time; pamphlet 8 times; books 34 times; court holdings 8 times; unclassified 7 times; unknown 39 times; debater assertion 22 times; and judicial notice 4 times.

Unknown led all categories for losing teams in the written point of origin with 22.9 percent of the total followed by books with 20 percent and public records with 14.1 percent of the total.

**Affirmative and negative teams**

Affirmative teams introduced a total of 216 pieces of evidence where the written point of origin could have been identified. Public records were used 23 times; newspapers 5 times; professional journals 11 times; popular journals 11 times; handbooks 1 time; personal experience 1 time; pamphlets 5 times; books 35 times; court holdings 9 times; unclassified 12 times; unknown 85 times; debater assertions 18 times; and judicial notice was not used.

Unknown led all categories for affirmative teams in the written point of origin with 39.4 percent of the total, followed by books with 16.2 percent and public records with 10.6 percent of the total.

Negative teams used 139 pieces of evidence where the written point of origin could have been identified. Public records were used 13 times; newspapers 7 times; professional journals 5 times; popular journals 14 times; handbooks 1 time; personal experience 1 time; pamphlets 6 times; books 28 times; court holdings 3 times; unclassified 8
times; unknown 85 times; debater assertion 14 times; and judicial notice 7 times.

Unknown led all categories for negative teams in the written point of origin with 23.5 percent of the total, followed by books with 20.1 percent of the total.

A summary of the results of classification by source may be found in Table VII.

Source Documentation

In addition to the four-point rating scale described earlier, the debaters were also analyzed by noting how often author, title, date, and page numbers were given for each piece of evidence cited.

Total for all debates

There was a total of 348 pieces of evidence introduced which the debaters had an opportunity to identify the source by author, title, date, and page.\(^{54}\) The author was identified 260 times or 74.5 percent of the time; title 151 times and 43.8 percent; date 190 times and 55 percent; and page 2 times and .579 percent of the total opportunities.

\(^{54}\) Evidence that was previously introduced and evidence introduced by judicial notice were not classified under source documentation.
TABLE VII

SUMMARY OF RESULTS FOR EVIDENCE
CLASSIFIED BY SOURCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Totals for all Debates</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Winning Teams</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Losing Teams</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Affirmative teams</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Negative teams</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Record</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.49</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Journal</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popular Journal</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7.04</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.49</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.65</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handbook</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.563</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Experience</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.563</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.540</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamphlet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued on the next page.
# TABLE VII

## SUMMARY OF RESULTS FOR EVIDENCE CLASSIFIED BY SOURCE (CON'T.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Totals for all debates</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Winning teams</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Losing teams</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Affirmative teams</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Negative teams</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Book</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court Holding</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.03</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debater Assertion</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8.01</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial Notice</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Incidence</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NOTE: No examples of interview were found in the six debates studied.*
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Of the 348 attempts at source documentation, 5 citations were given a rating of one; 109 citations were given a rating of two; 77 citations were given a rating of three; and 157 citations were given a rating of four. A rating of four was given to 45.1 percent of the citations of source documentation.

Winning and losing teams

Winning teams had 181 opportunities to identify author, title, date, and page. The author was identified 142 times or 78.5 percent of the time; title 70 times and 38.7 percent; date 88 times and 48.6 percent; and page 1 time or .552 percent of the total opportunities.

Of the 181 attempts at source documentation by winning teams, 2 citations were given ratings of one; 42 citations were given ratings of two; 49 citations were given ratings of three; and 88 citations were given ratings of four. A rating of four was given to 48.6 percent of the total attempts at source documentation, followed by ratings of three with 27.1 percent.

Losing teams had 167 opportunities to identify author, title, date, and page. The author was identified 118 times or 72 percent of the time; title 94 times and 57.3 percent; date 101 times and 61.6 percent; page 1 time or .006 percent of the total opportunities.

55 A rating of one means that textbook suggestions for the source documentation were met fully; a rating of two means the requirements were met partially; a rating of three that the requirements were met incompletely; and a rating of four that the requirements were met not at all.
Of the 167 attempts at source documentation by losing teams, 3 citations were given a rating of one; 67 citations were given ratings of two; 28 citations were given ratings of three; and 69 citations were given ratings of four. A rating of two was given to 40.9 percent of the citations of source documentation, followed by ratings of four with 35.5 percent and ratings of three with 17.1 percent of the total opportunities.

**Affirmative and negative teams**

Affirmative teams had 215 opportunities to identify author, title, date, and page. The author was identified 172 times or 80 percent of the time; title 87 times and 40.5 percent; date 119 times and 55.3 percent; and page 1 time or .005 percent of the total opportunities.

Of the 215 attempts at source documentation by affirmative teams, 4 citations were given ratings of one; 60 citations were given ratings of two; 46 citations were given ratings of three; 105 citations were given ratings of four. A rating of four was given to 48.8 percent of the total attempts at source documentation, followed by a rating of two with 27.9 percent and a rating of three with 21.4 percent.

Negative teams had 133 opportunities to identify author, title, date, and page. The author was identified 88 times or 67.7 percent of the time; title 77 times and 59.2 percent; date 70 times and 53.8 percent; and page 1 time or .008 percent of the total opportunities.
Of the 133 attempts at source documentation by negative teams, 1 citation was given a rating of one; 49 citations were given ratings of two; 31 citations were given ratings of three; 52 citations were given ratings of four. Ratings of four captures 39.1 percent of the total attempts at source documentation, followed by ratings of two with 37.7 percent and ratings of three with 23.8 percent.

A summary of the results for source identification may be found in Table VIII.

Source Qualification

There was general agreement among the texts surveyed that as a part of the citation of source documentation, one should explain the qualifications of the individual(s) making the statement. By far the most common practice among the debaters studied was to simply qualify experts by association with a well-known, presumably reputable, institution or group. As a result, the following information simply reports what was done to qualify sources rather than attempt to make a judgment about how well certain textbook criteria were met.

Three categories were used to classify statements where attempts were made to qualify sources: institutional affiliation; academic or professional degree; and, qualified by other means. The first negative constructive speech in the 1961 debate furnished an example of a source qualified by other means.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Totals for all debates</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Winning teams</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Losing teams</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Affirmative teams</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Negative teams</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Author</strong></td>
<td>260</td>
<td>74.5</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>78.5</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>67.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title</strong></td>
<td>151</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>59.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date</strong></td>
<td>190</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>53.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Page</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.579</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.552</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Opportunities</strong></td>
<td>348</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>133</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The debaters had 348 opportunities to identify their sources in each category of author, title, page, and date.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating of One</th>
<th>Rating of Two</th>
<th>Rating of Three</th>
<th>Rating of Four</th>
<th>Total Incidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Negative teams</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Affirmative teams</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Losing teams</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Winning teams</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Totals for all debates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table VIII
Let's turn to Michael M. Davis, who was a member of various medical-care commissions set up by the government, who wrote in 1956 in the book, *National Health Insurance*: "Though the population covered by comprehensive plans is as yet only a few million, these plans have demonstrated that comprehensive high quality medical care can be made available through health insurance at an annual cost of $150-$200 for a family."

Six categories were used to classify statements where no attempt was made to qualify sources by specifically stating qualifications: source nationally known; government agency; private organization; debaters; other--sources that did not clearly fit one of the preceding categories; and not given--statements where no attempt at qualification was made. Evidence previously introduced was not classified again but was noted and reported.

Typical of the statements classified as other was this piece of evidence from the first affirmative rebuttal speech in the 1963 debate:

The General Agreement on Tariff and Trade, March, 1962, points out the same thing. They tell us: "One of the more serious barriers confronting the less developed countries has been identified as being quantitative in poor restrictions."

Representative of the evidence classified as not given was this statement from the second affirmative constructive speech in the 1966 debate:

That might be good, except that J.C. Phillips wrote in *Municipal Government and Administration* that the Grand Jury is usually at the mercy of the local prosecutor. He is the one who must call it into session. If he's been corrupted, obviously the organized criminal operation will remain impenetrable.
Total for all debates

There was a total of 355 pieces of evidence for which the debaters had an opportunity to cite qualifications. In addition, 120 pieces of evidence were classified as having been previously introduced.

Of the sources where qualifications were given, 48 had institutional affiliations; 37 had professional or academic degrees; and 10 were qualified by other means. Of the sources where qualifications were not given, 63 were nationally known; 54 were government agencies; 36 were private organizations; 37 were attributed to the debaters; 41 sources were attributed to other; and there were 29 sources where qualifications were not given. Sources that had been previously introduced totaled 120.

Winning and losing teams

Winning teams had 185 opportunities to cite qualifications for evidentiary sources. Of the sources where qualifications were given, 31 had institutional affiliations; 22 had academic or professional degrees; and 5 were qualified by other means. Of the sources where qualifications were not given, 27 were nationally known; 26 were government agencies; 20 were private organizations; 14 were attributed to the debaters; 22 sources were attributed to other; and there were 18 sources where qualifications were not given. Sources that had been previously introduced totaled 62.
Losing teams had 170 opportunities to cite qualifications for evidentiary sources. Of the sources where qualifications were given, 17 had institutional affiliations; 15 had academic or professional degrees; and 5 were qualified by other means. Of the sources where qualifications were not given, 36 were nationally known; 28 were government agencies; 16 were private organizations; 23 were attributed to the debaters; 19 were attributed to other; and there were 11 sources where qualifications were not given. Sources that had been previously introduced totaled 58.

**Affirmative and negative teams**

Affirmative teams had 216 opportunities to cite qualifications for evidentiary sources. Of the sources where qualifications were given, 36 had institutional affiliations; 28 had academic or professional degrees; and 5 were qualified by other means. Of the sources where qualifications were not given, 33 were nationally known; 35 were government agencies; 21 were private organizations; 21 were attributed to the debaters; 19 were attributed to other; and there were 18 sources where qualifications were not given. Sources that had been previously introduced totaled 61.

Negative teams had 139 opportunities to cite qualifications for evidentiary sources. Of the sources where qualifications were given, 12 had institutional affiliations; 9 had academic or professional degrees; and 5 were qualified by other means. Of the sources where
qualifications were not given, 30 were nationally known; 19 were government agencies; 15 were private organizations; 16 were attributed to the debaters; 22 were attributed to other; and there were 11 sources where qualifications were not given. Sources that had been previously introduced totaled 59.

A summary of the results for evidence classified by source qualification may be found in Table IX.

Quantification of Evidence

Total for all debates

As a collective group the debaters used 475 pieces of evidence in the six debates or an average of 79.2 pieces per debate. Of the total amount of evidence used, 355 pieces were introduced into the debates only once; 85 pieces were referred to again after having been introduced into the debates; and, 35 pieces of evidence were new statements from sources that had been previously introduced into the debates.

Winning and losing teams

Winning teams introduced a total of 247 pieces of evidence or an average of 41.1 pieces per winning team. The 1961 affirmative team used the most evidence with 57 pieces of evidence and the 1962 negative team, the least with 27 pieces of evidence. The 1963 affirmative team used 47 pieces, the 1964 negative team 36 pieces, the 1965 affirmative team 32 pieces, and the 1966 affirmative team used 48 pieces of evidence.
### TABLE IX

**SUMMARY OF THE RESULTS OF EVIDENCE CLASSIFIED BY SOURCE QUALIFICATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources Qualified</th>
<th>Totals for all debates</th>
<th>Winning teams</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Losing teams</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Affirmative teams</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Negative teams</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Affiliation</strong></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional/Academic Degree</strong></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8.82</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Means</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued on the next page.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources Not Qualified</th>
<th>Totals for all debates</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Winning teams</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Losing teams</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Affirmative teams</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Negative teams</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nationally Known</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Agency</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Organization</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9.41</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9.72</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debater</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.57</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9.72</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8.80</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Given</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8.17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9.73</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.47</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8.34</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Incidence</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>8.17</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>139</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously Introduced</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Losing teams introduced a total of 228 pieces of evidence or an average of 38 pieces per losing team. The 1964 affirmative team used the most evidence for a losing team with 53 pieces and the 1965 negative team, the least with 29 pieces. The 1961 negative team used 36 pieces, the 1962 affirmative team 40 pieces, the 1963 negative team 33 pieces; and the 1966 negative team used 37 pieces of evidence.

**Affirmative and negative teams**

Affirmative teams introduced a total of 277 pieces of evidence or an average of 46.3 pieces per affirmative team. The 1961 affirmative team used the most evidence with 57 pieces and the 1965 affirmative team, the least with 32 pieces. The 1962 affirmative team used 40 pieces, the 1963 affirmative team 47 pieces, the 1964 affirmative team 53 pieces; and the 1966 affirmative team used 48 pieces of evidence.

Negative teams introduced a total of 198 pieces of evidence or an average of 33 pieces per negative team. The 1966 negative team used the most evidence with 37 pieces of evidence and the 1962 negative team, the least with 27 pieces. The 1961 negative team used 36 pieces of evidence, the 1963 negative team 33 pieces, the 1964 negative team 36 pieces; and the 1965 negative team used 37 pieces of evidence.

**Evidence and the Debate Proposition**

None of the debates studied supplied substantial reason for believing that any relationship existed between the debate proposition
and the type, special function class, presentational class, quality, documentation, or qualification of the evidence used. Only sparing evidence was discovered to support the conclusion that a relationship existed between the debate proposition and the "source" (written point of origin) of evidence used by the debaters. The 1962 debate on a legal-labor question made marked usage of court holdings, but the evidence in the other five debates originated largely from books, public records, and sources that were not given or could not be identified clearly enough by the author for classification.

Discussion

A good deal of difficulty was experienced in preparing the analysis because there was little unanimity of opinion among the textbook authors as to how evidence could or should be defined and classified. All too often the definition of evidence was based on theoretical rather than functional considerations. It seems reasonable that if the suggestions of the textbooks are to be of maximum value to the teacher and student of debate, they must reflect practice as well as theory.

Textbook categories for the classification of evidence by type or source often could not be used because they simply did not relate to contemporary academic debating. Typically, the categories that were dismissed as unusable originated in a legal rather than rhetorical usage. Knowing the distinction between legally competent and incompetent evidence, for example, is not very helpful in the academic
debating situation. Unfortunately, many of the categories suggested for classifying evidence in academic debating are no more useful than the example given. The categories that were usable did not encompass the practices of the debaters studied and new categories had to be created to supplement those suggested by the textbooks. While knowing the antecedents of contemporary debate concepts and practices is unquestionably of value, the writers of textbooks must create a new set of categories for classifying evidence that are based on rhetorical rather than legal usage.

As previously noted, the most commonly used types of evidence were facts and opinions. From the totals for all debates, the 181 fact statements and 158 opinions accounted for 46.4 percent and 40.5 percent of the total, respectively. These figures contrasted somewhat with Dresser's findings where he reported that opinion statements accounted for over 69 percent of the evidence used in the debates in his study. It is not known, however, if debater assertions were noted by him or included as part of the opinion total.

It is interesting to note that losing teams used debater assertions more than twice as often as winning teams. However, it is not known if this was a factor and if so, how much of a factor in winning or losing.

The debaters were something less than conscientious about identifying and qualifying the sources of their evidences. The totals for
all debates revealed that over 60 percent of the attempts at source documentation met the textbook requirements *incompletely* or *not at all*. Almost every textbook contains a section on the importance of evaluating an opponent's evidence, but such strategy is obviated if the source is not clearly identified. And, according to some authors, failure to adequately identify sources is unethical behavior.

Coaches and teachers of debate were no less concerned than textbook authors about debaters documenting and qualifying their sources. Klopf and McCroskey surveyed a number of teachers and coaches about their attitudes on certain aspects of academic debating. A questionnaire was sent to the 363 American Forensic Association members who were college teachers and coaches of debate at one time in their teaching career and to 195 high school teachers who were members of the National Forensic League. The results pertinent to this discussion represented the attitudes of the 244 collegiate respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Good Debate Technique</th>
<th>Poor Debate Technique</th>
<th>Questionable Ethics</th>
<th>Unethical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Failing to identify sources of information given in the debate.</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failing to demonstrate qualifications of &quot;authorities&quot; quoted.</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the opinion of most of the respondents, failure to identify and/or qualify sources was considered to be at least a poor debate technique and perhaps questionable ethics.

In fairness to the debaters, they may have broken one cardinal rule to observe another, i.e.—realizing that the audience in a final round usually consists of debaters and coaches who are familiar with the evidence that is likely to be used, the debaters adapted by abbreviating the documentation. However, if the final round of the National Debate Tournament is to exemplify good debate practice, then the preceding argument may be unjustifiable.

Whatever the case, standards for the identification and qualification of evidentiary materials should be made more uniform and the debaters forced to follow them by whatever means are necessary. Perhaps, as some have suggested, a special category could be created on debate ballots to judge the quality of source identification and qualification.

The incidence of evidence when recalled by totals for all debates revealed an average of 79.2 pieces per debate was used. No chronological trends were noted in either an increase or decrease in the quantities of evidence used.

In this study, evidence did not appear to be a function of the proposition. In some respects this was an unfortunate conclusion. Instead of relying on public records and professional journals, the debaters had a tendency to concentrate on newspapers, popular journals,
and other easily accessible materials. Such a reliance often subsidizes shoddy scholarship and shallow analysis. The debaters, however, are not likely to make major changes unless the pressure to do so comes from coaches and judges of academic debating.
CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

Summary

Importance of the Study

This study provides data relevant to teachers of debate and writers of argumentation texts on certain aspects of the use of evidence by successful intercollegiate student debaters. The study makes a contribution to intercollegiate forensics by representing a relevant move in a series of steps toward analytically testing the relationship between textbook theory and the practice of successful debaters.

Purpose of the Study

The study had two basic purposes: (A) to discover and describe the sources, types, quantities, and documentation of evidence by successful tournament debaters, and (B) to compare successful debate practice with contemporary textbook theory on the source, types, quantities and documentation of evidence.

Review of the Literature

In reviewing the literature in the field, it was found that this study differed significantly from any other previous research in one
or more of the following ways: (1) the debates that were studied, (2) the time period over which the debates occurred, or (3) the analysis which was applied.

Source of Data

The final rounds of the National Debate Tournament for 1961 through 1966 were selected for study. These teams were selected not only because they were supposedly the best in the country, but also because the final rounds were tape recorded and transcripts were published.

Thirteen leading textbooks in argumentation and debate were reviewed, their categories and suggestions on evidence recorded, synthesized and used in the analysis.

Research Questions

In order to achieve the stated objectives, these eight research questions about textbook theory and debate practice were formulated and investigated:

1. What are the types of evidence described by textbooks in argumentation and debate?

2. What are the sources of evidence commonly described by accepted textbooks in argumentation and debate?

3. What suggestions do textbooks in argumentation and debate make about the documentation of evidence?

4. What sources of evidence commonly described by argumentation and debate texts are used most by successful debaters?
5. What types of evidence commonly described by argumentation and debate texts are used most by successful debaters?

6. How thoroughly do successful debaters follow the suggestions of argumentation and debate texts in regards to the documentation of evidence?

7. To what extent is evidence used by successful debaters?

8. What is the relationship (if any) between the type and/or source of evidence used and the proposition being considered?

Definition of Evidence

Counted as evidence in this study was any informative statement used to support a speaker's argument. Statements not enclosed in quotation marks or attributed to a specific source were included as well as statements obviously quoted or clearly documented.

Types of Evidence

Four major categories were used to classify the "types" of evidence used by the debaters in the six debates that were studied. Fact and opinion were suggested as categories by the textbooks. However, to accurately describe debater practice a third and fourth major category, debater assertion and fact-opinion were established.

Facts and opinions were the most used categories accounting for 46.4 percent and 40.5 percent respectively of the total amount of new evidence for all debates. Winning teams relied on facts 45 percent of the time and opinions 46.5 percent, while losing teams used facts 47.9 percent of the time and opinions only 34.2 percent of the time.
Affirmative teams used *facts* 38.4 percent of the time compared to the negative's 57 percent, and *opinion* 48.5 percent compared to the negative's usage of 29.1 percent.

Losing teams used *debater assertion* more than twice as often as winning teams.

Special functional and presentational classes were developed to assist in describing the "types" of evidence used by the debaters.

**Special function classes**

Five categories were employed to classify the use of evidence by special function class. Three new categories, *quotation, definition*, and *summary*, were established to supplement *judicial notice* and *aliunde* which were suggested by the textbooks surveyed.

In the totals for all debates, *definition* led all special function classes with 5.64 percent of the total. Following were *quotation, aliunde, judicial notice*, and *summary*, each with less than 2 percent of the total. With one exception, similar patterns were noted for winning and losing teams as well as for affirmative and negative teams. Negative teams provide the exception by citing all 7 examples of *judicial notice*—this figure represents 4.43 percent of the evidence used by negative teams.

**Presentational classes**

Eight categories were employed to classify the use of evidence by presentational class. In addition to *specific factual statement, fac*
tual generalization, opinion statement, analogy, example, and statistics which were suggested by the textbooks, these new categories were created: value statement and combination.

Opinion statements led all other presentational classes with 34.9 percent of the totals for all debates, followed by factual generalization with 19.7 percent and specific factual statements with 16.7 percent.

Opinion statements led all other presentational classes for winning teams with 40.5 percent of the total. This category was followed by factual generalization with 21 percent and specific factual statement with 16 percent. Opinion statements also led all classes for losing teams with 28.9 percent of the total followed by factual generalization with 18.4 percent and specific factual statements with 17.3 percent. Affirmative teams used opinion statements most with 42.2 percent of the total, followed by factual generalizations with 19.8 percent and specific factual statements with 12.5 percent. Opinion statements followed the earlier pattern by leading all presentational classes for negative teams with 24.1 percent of the total. In second place and breaking the earlier pattern were specific factual statements with 22.8 percent of the total, followed by factual generalizations with 19.6 percent.
Sources of Evidence

Twelve categories were employed to classify the evidence used by its written point of origin. Textbook theory suggested nine categories consisting of: public records, newspapers, professional journals, popular journals, handbooks, personal experience, pamphlets, interviews, and books. Three additional categories were used to supplement the other nine: court holdings, unclassified, and unknown.²⁷

Although interview was suggested as a category by the textbooks surveyed, there were no examples found in the six debates studied.

Unknown led all categories for winning teams in the written point of origin with 42.7 percent of the total, followed by books with 15.7 percent. Similarly, unknown led all categories for losing teams with 22.9 percent of the total, followed by books with 20 percent and public records with 14.1 percent of the total.

The written point of origin for evidence used by the affirmative teams was most often classified as unknown with 39.4 percent of the total, followed by books with 16.2 percent and public records with 10.6 percent of the total. Likewise, unknown led all categories for negative teams with 23.5 percent of the total, followed by books with 20.1 percent of the total.

²⁷Unclassified refers to statements that could not be clearly classified in one of the preceding categories; and unknown refers to statements for which no source was given.
Source Documentation

For the purposes of this study, documentation was a statement of the source materials of the evidence in a speech. The documentation of evidence by the debaters was analyzed in two ways: (1) by noting how often author, title, date, and page numbers were given for each piece of evidence cited; (2) by rating the adequacy of the documentation on a four-point scale. 58

Of the total for all debates, the author was identified 260 times or 74.5 percent of the time; title 151 times and 43.8 percent; date 190 times and 55 percent; page 2 times and .579 percent. A rating of four was given to 44.6 percent of the citations of source documentation; a rating of three was given to 22.3 percent; a rating of two to 31.6 percent; and a rating of one to 1.45 percent of the citations.

Winning teams identified the author 142 times or 78.5 percent of the time; title 79 times and 38.7 percent; date 88 times and 48.6 percent; and page 1 time or .552 percent. A rating of four was given to 48.6 percent of the total attempts at source documentation by winning teams.

58 A rating of one means that textbook suggestions for source documentation were met fully; a rating of two means the requirements were met partially; a rating of three that the requirements were met incompletely; and a rating of four that the requirements were met not at all.
teams, followed by ratings of three with 27.1 percent, ratings of two with 23.2 percent, and ratings of one with 1.10 percent of the citations.

Losing teams identified the author 118 times or 72 percent of the time; title 94 times and 57.3 percent; date 101 times and 61.6 percent; page 1 time or .006 percent. A rating of two was given to 40.9 percent of the citations of source documentation by losing teams, followed by ratings of four with 35.5 percent; ratings of three with 17.1 percent; and ratings of one with 1.83 percent of the citations.

Affirmative teams identified the author 172 times or 80 percent of the time; title 87 times and 40.5 percent; date 119 times and 55.3 percent; and page 1 time or .005 percent. A rating of four was given to 48.8 percent of the total attempts at source documentation by affirmative teams, followed by ratings of two with 27.9 percent; ratings of three with 21.4 percent; and ratings of one with 1.86 percent of the citations.

Negative teams identified the author 88 times or 67.7 percent of the time; title 77 times and 59.2 percent; date 70 times and 53.8 percent; and page 1 time or .008 percent. A rating of four was given to 39.1 percent of the total attempts at source documentation by negative teams, followed by ratings of two with 37.7 percent; ratings of three with 23.8 percent; and ratings of one with .008 percent of the citations.
Source Qualification

Because the debaters seldom referred to a list of credentials when qualifying a source, this study simply described what was done to qualify sources rather than attempt to make a judgment about how well certain textbook criteria were met.

Three categories were used to classify statements where attempts were made to qualify sources: institutional affiliation; academic or professional degrees; and qualified by other means.

Five categories were used to classify statements where no attempt was made to qualify sources by specifically stating qualifications: source nationally known; government agency; private organization; debaters; other—sources that did not clearly fit one of the preceding categories; and not given—statements where no attempt at qualification was made.

In the totals for all debates where qualifications were given, 48 had institutional affiliations; 32 had professional or academic degrees; and 10 were qualified by other means. Of the sources where qualifications were given, 63 were nationally known; 54 were government agencies; 36 were private organizations; 37 were attributed to the debaters; 41 sources were attributed to other; and there were 29 sources where qualifications were not given. Sources that had been previously introduced totaled 120.

Of the totals for winning teams where qualifications were given, 31 had institutional affiliations, 22 had academic or professional
degrees; and 5 were qualified by other means. Of the sources where qualifications were not given, 27 were nationally known; 26 were government agencies; 20 were private organizations; 14 were attributed to the debaters; 22 sources were attributed to other; and there were 18 sources where qualifications were not given. Sources that had been previously introduced totaled 62.

Of the sources where qualifications were given by losing teams, 17 had institutional affiliations; 15 had academic or professional degrees; and 5 were qualified by other means. Of the sources where qualifications were not given, 36 were nationally known; 28 were government agencies; 16 were private organizations; 23 were attributed to the debaters; 19 were attributed to other; and there were 11 sources where qualifications were not given. Sources that had been previously introduced totaled 58.

Affirmative teams followed a similar pattern as winners and losers with sources for which qualifications were given: 36 had institutional affiliations; 28 had academic or professional degrees; and 5 were qualified by other means. Of the sources where qualifications were not given, 33 were nationally known; 35 were government agencies; 21 were private organizations; 21 were attributed to the debaters; 19 were attributed to other; and there were 18 sources where qualifications were not given. Sources that had been previously introduced totaled 61.
Of the sources where qualifications were given by negative teams, 12 had institutional affiliations; 9 had academic or professional degrees; and 5 were qualified by other means. Of the sources where qualifications were not given, 30 were nationally known; 19 were government agencies; 15 were private organizations; 16 were attributed to the debaters; 22 were attributed to other; and there were 11 sources where qualifications were not given. Sources that had been previously introduced totaled 59.

Quantification of Evidence

As a collective group, the debaters used 475 pieces of evidence in the six debates or an average of 79.2 pieces per debate.

Winning teams introduced a total of 247 pieces of evidence or an average of 41.1 pieces per winning team. Losing teams introduced a total of 228 pieces of evidence or an average of 38 pieces per losing team.

Affirmative teams introduced a total of 277 pieces of evidence or an average of 46.3 pieces per affirmative team. Negative teams introduced a total of 198 pieces of evidence or an average of 33 pieces per negative team.

Evidence and the Debate Proposition

Only the 1962 debate supplied evidence of a possible relationship between the debate proposition and any of the major classifications of
evidence. The source of evidence in the 1962 debate on a legal-labor question made marked usage of court holdings, but the evidence in the other five debates originated largely from books, public records, and sources that were not given or could not be identified clearly enough for classification.

Conclusions

In drawing any conclusions from this study, a number of limiting and qualifying factors should be noted. Any study of this sort is subject to a wide variety of error and miscalculation, all carefully designed reliability measures not withstanding. Literally thousands of decisions were made in attempting to classify and/or rate the evidence used in the six debates. Even assuming no mechanical errors in classifying and counting, the possibility of interpretive error can not be passed over lightly. Finally, with the narrow scope of the debates studied and the imprecision of the measuring tools (in no small part the researcher), extrapolation about academic debating in general or successful debaters in particular should be undertaken with caution.

Nevertheless, the study did yield several tentative conclusions:

1. The definition of evidence offered by the argumentation texts was too narrow to make possible the classification of what reasonably
seemed evidentiary material. There was little unanimity of opinion about how evidence could or should be defined.

2. Many of the categories suggested by the textbooks for classifying evidence by type or source were non-applicable to the academic debating situation. Typically the categories that were dismissed as unusable originated in a legal rather than rhetorical usage. The categories that were usable did not encompass the practices of the debaters studied and new categories had to be created to supplement those suggested by the textbooks.

3. The most commonly used types of evidence were facts and opinions. Although a number of debater assertions were noted, the count may have been low because of the difficulty in distinguishing evidentiary assertions from assertions that were being supported with other evidence. Because of the high incidence of debater assertions among the losing teams, it would appear that a debater seeking to win should avoid assertions as much as possible.

4. The most commonly used sources of evidence were books, public records, and popular journals. But, almost 50 percent of the evidence cited was not attributed to a source or the reference was not sufficiently clear to allow for identification and classification.

5. The debaters fell far short of meeting textbook expectations for the identification of evidence. The totals for all debates revealed that over 60 percent of the attempts at source documentation met the textbook requirements incompletely or not at all.
6. In the totals for all debates, an average of 79.2 pieces of evidence per debate was used. No trends for lessened or increased usage of evidence were noted in the six debates.

7. There was little substantial evidence to indicate a relationship between the evidence used and the debate proposition, i.e. -- evidence does not appear to be a function of the proposition.

8. By combining the results from several areas, it was possible to identify certain characteristics of winning teams in the six debates studied. The winning teams were most often on the affirmative side; used large quantities of poorly documented, opinion evidence; and avoided using a great number of assertions. The losing teams were most often on the negative side; used large quantities of poorly documented, fact evidence; and used twice as many assertions as the winning teams.

**Recommendations**

Any study that analyzes only the final rounds runs the risk of drawing conclusions that are not typical of all the rounds in that tournament, much less for academic debating in general. Other studies using similar methodology might be conducted with successful debaters in preliminary rounds to determine if there is a consistent pattern of behavior in the way that evidence is used.
It would also be valuable to know what patterns for the use of evidence are followed by unsuccessful or average debaters. Comparisons could then be made with the practices of successful debaters to determine if any differences exist.

A Toulmin analysis on the use of evidence by successful debaters would provide information on the relationship between the evidence used and the conclusions that are drawn.

Experimental investigations could provide valuable information with regard to: the effectiveness of employing different forms of evidence; the role of wording or introductory phrases in increasing the effectiveness of evidence; and, the effectiveness of using opinion evidence as opposed to fact evidence and in what quantities.

Implications

When the results of this research are combined with the findings of other studies, it becomes much easier to appreciate the position of some critics of academic debating. There is considerable and mounting evidence that some debaters reduce their communication effectiveness by the rapid-fire presentation of large quantities of poorly documented evidence. Likewise, many interested observers have become disenchanted by what appears to be a growing tendency among some debaters to put winning strategy ahead of any ethical or educational considerations.
Obviously, it is not enough for coaches, judges, and other interested parties to be merely concerned about weak strategic and/or unethical use of evidence. Only when concern is translated into action can such conditions be ameliorated. Large steps in the right direction could be taken if textbook writers gave clear, definite suggestions about the procurement and use of evidence; if coaches established unmistakable standards for their teams in the presentation of evidence, and; if coaches and judges insisted on the proper use of evidence by marking the ballots appropriately.

It seems clear that if academic debate is to survive as an educationally justifiable activity, it must be prepared to meet the demands and stresses that confront it from time-to-time. Policy in regard to the procurement, strategic employment, and ethical usage of evidence is not the only source of stress at this time. However, it is a serious one and a condition that could be resolved by concerted and appropriate action on the part of all concerned.
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