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Lincoln-Douglas debate offered by the National Forensic Association is uniquely situated within the collegiate forensic context. The event uses a traditional debate format and emphasizes traditional aspects of academic debate: evidence, reasoning, cross-examination, and refutation. However, as currently practiced, Lincoln-Douglas debate is sponsored by an organization dedicated to communicative performance in which high standards for presentation are encouraged. In addition, NFA Lincoln-Douglas is usually held in conjunction with individual events tournaments and, as a result, many Lincoln-Douglas judges who have individual events backgrounds tend to view the event differently than a judge who has National Debate Tournament (NDT) or Cross-Examination Debate Association (CEDA) experience. Finally, the NFA rules explicitly call for the de-emphasis of traditional debate style, stressing instead the importance of rhetorical sensitivity and persuasion. As a consequence of the unique situation of NFA Lincoln-Douglas, the event has been plagued by misunderstanding, controversy, and discrepant judging philosophies.

This article contends that the "schizophrenic" nature of NFA Lincoln-Douglas has created multiple judging criteria and that, so far, dialogue on the subject has failed to identify a predominant judging philosophy. We argue that NFA Lincoln-Douglas judges should use a "critical listener" perspective to evaluate rounds. A critical listener perspective recognizes the importance of traditional debate concepts, while at the same time acknowledging that subjective factors may intervene in the judge's decision in a round. To support this argument, we first survey the various paradigms employed by judges in traditional debate contexts and assess their appropriateness for NFA Lincoln-Douglas. Second, we explain an approach for judging individual events. Finally, we elaborate on the
"critical listener" perspective and the implications it would have for the activity.

THE WORLD VIEWS OF POLICY DEBATE JUDGES

Prominent figures in the field of argumentation have suggested that the role of paradigms—or world views—is one of the critical issues confronting contemporary forensic practice. Robert H. Gass, Jr., wrote in 1988 "That disputes involving debate paradigms have occupied the center stage of the debate literature for the last half dozen years" (p. 78). These competing perspectives have presented important problems for debaters, coaches, and judges, while also raising questions about the educational nature of competitive debate.

Debate paradigms were not intended to apply only to four-person NDT/policy or CEDA/fact-value debate formats. In fact, many Lincoln-Douglas judges, since the inception of NFA Lincoln-Douglas competition, have used these common debate paradigms, which we contend, do not effectively guide NFA Lincoln-Douglas judges and competitors. Common debate paradigms emphasize the technical nature of debate and do not adequately consider the audience-centered approach of NFA Lincoln-Douglas. This section of the paper reviews traditional debate paradigms and discusses aspects of them which may have application to Lincoln-Douglas debate.

Standard Policy Debate Paradigms

Competitive debaters make generalizations about the nature of the judging pool in competition. These generalizations inevitably lead to certain assumptions, on the part of these competitors, about the kinds of decisions that certain judges will make. Further, with the proliferation within the debate community of judging philosophy sheets, students and coaches are attempting to draw conclusions about how best to adapt to certain judging philosophies.

Common among the so-called paradigms employed in contemporary secondary school and collegiate academic debate are tabula rasa, policy making, hypothesis testing, stock issues, and
skills. From informal observation, policy making and tabula rasa would appear to be the most regularly used, followed by the stock issues approach. One can envision, for the purposes of this discussion, a continuum that stretches from consistently non-interventionist to regularly interventionist—with intervention being the act of the judge taking an active role in the debate and its decision. These perspectives are then stretched out along this continuum according to their degree of judge involvement.

The judge who adheres to the "tabula rasa" or "games" world view considers himself or herself a blank slate. Any argument made by a competitor is acceptable (Ziegelmueller, Harris, and Bloomingdale, 1995, p. 22). Taken to its greatest extreme, a debater could state All pigs are blue and failure to deny that pigs are blue should justify a ballot for the negative." In the very strictest sense, a tabula rasa judge would be compelled to vote negative if this argument went undenied. The approach assumes that the debaters take charge and guide the round. Ulrich argued, "it is an approach to judging that emphasizes the desirability of having debate rules evolved from each individual debate instead of being imposed upon a round externally by the judge" (1987, p. 185), which is by far the most non-interventionist of the perspectives.

Policy making operates on the assumption that the judge in a debate is a maker of policy and the debate is focused on the evaluation of competing policy options (Ziegelmueller, Harris, and Bloomingdale, 1995, p. 18-19). Debaters who place a judge in a policy making framework may adopt a case structure that advocates replacing or modifying core values in a policy system (Lichtman, et al., 1987, p. 229) or simply replacing one policy with another. In practice this philosophy has evolved around a metaphor that suggests, when the judge signs the ballot, he or she is acting as the government—actually implementing the policy. Such judges tend to be more concerned with the "weight" of the advantages of the affirmative plan versus the disadvantages offered by the negative against the plan. Issues of inherency and solvency, while they may play a factor in the decision, tend to be subordinate in importance to issues of harm and cost. Again, this perspective tends to be fairly non-interventionist.
The hypothesis tester treats every argument as an independent test of the truth (Ziegelmueller, Harris, and Bloomingdale, 1995, pp. 20-21). The model the hypothesis tester employs is social scientific in nature. Zarefsky noted, "the judge of argument is the counterpart of the scientist; his goal is to test the hypothesis to determine whether it is probably true" (1987, p. 208). Under this perspective, a debater might advance competing and contradictory arguments in the same speech, suggesting that while they cannot both be right, at least one will be selected by the end of the debate. The appropriate analogy to describe this perspective is that of a scientist who uses fifteen different reactants on an unknown substance in an attempt to discover its true identity by the process of elimination. Ultimately, this perspective requires the debater to guide the judge to make the appropriate choices. Yet, it leaves open the possibility of intervention in an unorganized debate.

The most traditional of the approaches to evaluating policy debate is the stock issues approach. In policy debates, a stock issues judge evaluates the existence of an inherent barrier to change (blame), a harm that is a product of the present system (ill), a degree of solvency stemming from the proposed plan (cure), the existence of negative results or disadvantages (cost), and his or her own jurisdiction to hear the debate (topicality) (Ziegelmueller, Harris, and Bloomingdale, 1995, pp. 16-18). In fact-value debates, such as occasionally offered by the Cross Examination Debate Association (CEDA), a framework similar to the classical rhetorical system of *stasis* is employed. Here, it is assumed that the affirmative must win all of the stock issues to justify an affirmative decision. Consequently, the decisions are governed largely by the debaters' effectiveness in telling a good story on each of the required issues and their success at fulfilling the proof burdens imposed by the stock issues template. Provided debaters and judges adhere to the stock issues, intervention should not occur with any great frequency.

Finally, the skills oriented judge approaches the debate from a pedagogical perspective. Such judges set their own standards for what is an acceptable argument based mostly on what they see as being educationally beneficial. A judge operating under the skills paradigm would focus on things such as delivery, quality of
argument, realism of the arguments, and coherence of the story. To a certain extent, these judges are unpredictable because they do intervene in the round based on their own pre-conceived standards of effective debating (Ziegelmueller, Harris, and Bloomingdale, 1995, p. 23).

Despite the ostensible claim that the judge has the freedom to develop his or her own philosophy, and despite the claim—on paper—that some of these perspectives allow for intervention, the reality is that the debate community expects the judge to remain uninvolved. Hollihan, Baaske, and Riley wrote in 1987:

> the present norm of professional conduct encourages judges to evaluate every debate as a unique and individual contest, and discourages them from imposing their personal opinions about debate theory or the issues being deliberated upon by the debaters. Those judges who violate this norm and impose their opinions on the debates they judge are viewed by debaters and most coaches as highly subjective and potentially unfair. Perhaps even worse, they are "unmodern."

Professional standards in contemporary debate dictate a non-interventionist judging stance, and few judges wish to violate such pervasive norms. (p. 185)

This condition has set up the elements for a still unresolved controversy in the debate community, that being the role of the expert critic.

**CHALLENGES: THE LAY JUDGE VS. THE EXPERT**

No consensus exists within the debate community as to what is an ideal paradigm. In fact, some argumentation scholars theorize that some of these perspectives cannot be fairly called paradigms "in the conventional sense of the term" (Hollihan, Baaske and Riley, 1987, p. 185). Some more recent authors have begun to debate the question of the role of the judge in the round and, more specifically, the possible value of intervention in the conduct of academic debate. This question is central to the development of a perspective for judging NFA Lincoln-Douglas since Lincoln-Douglas is an
audience-centered format.

In 1987, Hollihan, Baaske, and Riley argued for the introduction of a version of Walter Fisher's narrative perspective into academic debate. Fisher's perspective, described in a March, 1984, issue of Communication Monographs, assumes that humans are basically story tellers and that arguments are, in effect, a series of stories which are judged by their audience through standards of narrative probability (coherence) and narrative fidelity (whether the argument rings true with the experiences of the person sitting in judgment). Hollihan, Baaske, and Riley liken these standards to tests of internal and external consistency and suggest that such a perspective, if employed, would help reinvigorate academic debate. The authors contend that academic debate suffers from several maladies, among which is the choice of most judges to check their own perspectives at the door:

Our position, however, is that most judges have surrendered even this relatively small amount of control over the character and communication rules of academic debate. Judges have become partners with the students they judge, creating and recreating a model of debate which encourages policy debaters to emulate the behaviors of highly trained technically skilled public policy advocates. These debaters present their arguments to "expert" judges who possess the ability to evaluate these complex claims (Hollihan & Riley, 1987). For judges, being experts means more than having the background in argumentation theory to sort through many technical, complex arguments supported by tremendous volumes of evidence. It also means suspending one's own beliefs and values, and giving all arguments a fair hearing (Balthrop, 1979). (p. 184)

Further, these critics suggest that the nature of the process has created a community closed to outsiders and has advanced an "elitist ideology which presumes that the man or woman off the street is too uninformed, uninterested, unintelligent, or biased to play an important policy making role" (1987, p. 185).
Hollihan, Baaske, and Reilly recognize that to advocate the narrative perspective requires the endorsement of judge intervention in the debate round. They embrace this notion, saying that the judge would now have the duty of comparing rival stories and being an active participant in the round. This, in turn, would improve communication style, diminish the significance of expert opinion evidence in the debate and make debate more accessible to the common person again (pp. 190-192).

Fearing the problem of excessive judge intervention, Robert H. Gass countered the narrative perspective in 1988, offering instead the model of the judge as "expert auditor" (p. 85). Gass accepts the position that the lack of an avenue for intervention is the source of many of academic debate's problems (p. 85), but contends that intervention should be based on the judge's experience as an expert on the art of argument and as an expert on the subject matter of the resolution (p. 85). This perspective offers a compromise between debate as it is practiced presently and the clearly radical alteration that Hollihan, Baaske, and Riley propose.

Contemporary academic debate presents judges with a variety of options to use as analytic frames. Yet these frames, while very different from each other, all share the influence of the common view that judges cannot intervene in the debate itself and must leave their own thoughts and experiences at home. This view contrasts with that which prevails in the individual events community.

A PHILOSOPHY OF INDIVIDUAL EVENTS JUDGING

Individual events judging philosophies have not been the subject of the same amount of discussion as debate paradigms. While debate judging paradigms are grounded in a philosophical/theoretical position, individual events are viewed as "real world" activities subject to the evaluation of judges and coaches who act as audience members. The judge in an individual events round often uses an implicit judging paradigm which is grounded in the principles of real-world communication. Unlike the debate judge, who is a trained policymaker or hypothesis tester, the individual events judge is part of the audience and supposedly reacts to the speech in a
manner that is similar to that of other audience members. Whereas debaters privilege logos, often at the expense of pathos and ethos, individual events competitors ideally use all the tools of persuasion available to them and the judge evaluates the performance as a whole, as opposed to individual lines of reasoning. Kay asserted that "individual events provide a realistic laboratory for the testing of argument and ideas" (1983, p. 927). The realistic context of individual events differs greatly from the context of academic debate and should influence the development of a NFA Lincoln-Douglas judging perspective. What follows is a description—not a prescription—of the state of individual events judging attitudes in collegiate forensics.

At the outset, the judge must determine whether the speech conformed to the established rules of the activity. The national associations have established sets of rules for each individual event. For example, speeches must be within specified time limits, they must be performed primarily in English, etc. Having determined that the speech was within the parameters of the rules, the individual events judge then typically fuses subjective and objective factors in making a judgment in the round. In other words, the objective, technical merits of the speech are weighed against the subjective factors of persuasiveness and credibility by the individual events judge, and a score is assigned based on the total effectiveness of the speech.

First, the judge measures the degree to which the speaker achieves a level of skills achievement. There are certain theoretical principles which guide the individual events performance. For example, organization is typically seen as an important component of a prepared event. Speeches which lack organization are usually downgraded. Those speeches which are well-organized are typically given higher marks. A student competing in persuasion should use evidence to support his or her claims. Likewise, a student who competes in prose should use the literature to develop a theme/thesis/argument. Thus, the theoretical aspects of the speech are evaluated by the judge.

However, individual events coaches, judges, and competitors fully recognize that these theoretical principles are not absolutes and that judges who have different levels of expertise will
evaluate the speeches differently. For example, while organization is important, judges have different notions on how best to structure a persuasive speech. In fact, the problem-solution format has become the standard on the collegiate circuit. Other formats, however, are used and are effective. Likewise, a veteran judge who has published numerous articles in the Quarterly Journal of Speech would, no doubt, scrutinize a competitor's rhetorical criticism more closely than the first year master's student who is only one year out of competition.

Numerous forensic convention papers, journal articles, and development conferences have addressed the notion of establishing criteria for judging individual events. Some participants wish to systematize the criteria for each event so that there are more or less "objective" standards by which to judge each event. Mills (1983) argued, "If any degree of uniformity is to be realized, the area of judging criteria must become a major concern in forensics" (p. 20). Mills is not alone in his call for judging criteria. The forensic community, however, is divided about the desirability of criteria and which criteria should be used. However, the technical merits of the speaking performance is one aspect of the judge's evaluation.

A second type of standard used by judges is the evaluation of the subjective factors of the student's speech. Rhodes, Faules, and Rieke (1976) wrote, "A valid, though quite subjective guideline, therefore, is for the judge to ask whether the presentation moved him [or her]" (p. 250). They continued, "Emotional involvement, subordinated almost completely to information-processing in academic debate, must be registered and accounted for in evaluating the [individual events] contestants' performances" (p. 247). In other words, the judge evaluates the degree to which the student identifies with, convinces, or moves the judge and audience to action. Kosloski has identified these subjective factors as, "impressions that reflect, among other things, empathy for the speaker, perceived level of ethos, personal preference for style, and interest in the topic" (p. 2). The students should creatively use evidence and pathos to create a speech that is communicatively effective, as well as technically sound. That is, the judge may rate a technically perfect speech lower than a speech that, while not perfect, is more convincing. Dean summarized, "The forensics community must
embrace the notion that oral discourse is more than a mouth in front of a face turned towards another body; rather oral communication is an address to an audience, a communication act accomplished with others" (196). The individual events judge fuses the objective and subjective merits of the speech in passing judgment on the performance.

POINTS OF CLASH

The preceding discussion has identified several important differences between individual events and debate judging perspectives. It is not necessarily that the values or criteria are completely antithetical to one another, but rather that it becomes difficult for a judge to evaluate a performance using these different standards simultaneously. Issues of subjective standards of judging, intervention of the judge in the round, judge adaptation and decision making standards are examined here.

First, debate and individual events judges differ substantially on the role subjective standards should play in evaluating the quality of a given round. While both debate and individual events ballots use quality rating and ranking systems, their purpose differs. In traditional academic debate the first and foremost goal is victory. The win or loss is the first issue for the judge to decide and this decision is usually centered around the outcome of the arguments on the flow sheet. The assignment of points for speaking quality comes later, and—excepting speaker awards—these points are used primarily as tie breakers. Low-point wins can be assigned denoting lower quality speaking skills but a win on the flow sheet nonetheless. In individual events, the point and ranking system more directly reflects the perception of speaker quality. A competitor could not win the round and have a ranking of six. Issues of delivery, message, adaptation, decorum, etc., all play into the final decision and place the student in the round accordingly.

Put simply, it is far more acceptable for a student in debate to stand awkwardly, avoid eye contact, gasp uncontrollably for breath due to speed of delivery, and dress in a less professional manner since the debate will most likely be decided on the basis of logical argument. While presentation and style may affect how
clearly the message is received, these subjective criteria which we are familiar with in the world of individual events are clearly not of as much concern to the logically-centered debate adjudicator.

Second, debate and individual events judges differ on their willingness to become an active participant, to intervene, in the round. Debate judges, as discussed previously, have come to exist under a community enforced standard of non-intervention that holds that personal opinions and criteria are to be left outside of the debate. Individual events judges, however, seem fully willing to impose themselves on a round. The following example illustrates the differences between the two perspectives. It is fairly common knowledge that during the 50th Anniversary celebrations for the United Nations Chinese President Jiang Zemin met in an informal summit meeting with President Bill Clinton. This was a well publicized and widely reported fact due to its role in an extremely tense period in Sino-American relations. Consider a debate round in which one team asserts that the summit took place and, therefore, relations must be improving. The opposition argues that they have no knowledge of such a summit and, absent evidence from the other team, the argument should be disregarded. If the judge knows that the summit took place, but evidence is not present, many judges could side with the second team, contending that under the philosophy of non-intervention he or she cannot rely on outside knowledge to settle the argument. In contrast, a judge of extemporaneous speaking would almost certainly criticize a speaker who asserted that no summit had taken place, simply because the prevailing assumption is that the individual events judge brings with him or herself the knowledge and critical ability of the average audience member, as well as professional standards, for what constitutes a good speech.

Third, the differences between debate and individual events judges create differences in how students and their coaches go about adapting speeches to particular audiences. The process of judge adaptation in debate has become extremely specialized in recent years. The identity of many active judges on the policy debating circuit is defined clearly in the National Debate Tournament judging philosophy book. Similarly, many invitational tournaments require that judges fill out philosophy sheets to further define their judging
preferences. Some debate tournaments, including the national tournament, also employ "strike" sheets that allow a coach to block certain judges from being assigned to their students. When these factors are taken together, students have a fairly good idea of a judge's exact philosophy. Past experiences with certain judges further define this knowledge. Adaptation then becomes a fairly easy task.

In contrast, individual events judges have a far less defined paradigm. Where philosophies do exist they are generally not widely publicized. While students can learn about what a judge looks for by studying ballots over time, the decisions of judges still have a strong probability of varying depending on the particular event and subject matter. Just as individual events competition more closely mirror real life speaking situations, so too does the ability to adapt to the audience more closely mirror the imprecise science of adapting to an incompletely known audience.

Finally, judges in individual events do not rely on students setting standards for evaluation in the round. While debate judges—particularly those who espouse a tabula rasa or games paradigm—expect students to tell them how to evaluate the round, an individual events judge is never a tabula rasa. At no time would one observe a student in a persuasion round saying, "You should give the first ranking to the one of us whose problem highlights the greatest number of deaths. You should reject all qualitative standards for significance." The judges' preconceived standards are more important to the individual events round than standards articulated by the students.

THE CRITICAL LISTENER PERSPECTIVE

Given the incompatibility between debate judging paradigms and individual events judging philosophy, it is necessary to advance a judging perspective ideally suited for Lincoln-Douglas. We present the "critical listener perspective" as a means of guiding NFA Lincoln-Douglas judges. A critical listener perspective for Lincoln-Douglas debate presumes that the audience members (most importantly the judge) are the locus of the round. They are critical listeners who are capable of evaluating the debate based upon their
experience, specialized knowledge, and use of standards for what is educationally valuable and who permit subjective standards to influence how the decision is reached. This view assumes that the judge will consider both objective and subjective standards in evaluating a Lincoln-Douglas round and will not shy away from correcting perceived inadequacies in the presentation through the pedagogically beneficial act of critiquing the speech act and ranking it according to all of its merits.

The primary question this perspective should raise in the minds of traditional debate judges and proponents of traditional debate paradigms is: why reject traditional debate paradigms for a debate activity? The answers are quite simple and consistent with the philosophy that led to the creation of NFA Lincoln-Douglas Debate. First, to employ a traditional debate judging philosophy defeats the purpose of developing a new debate forum. Second, the new perspective better allows the NFA to streamline and integrate NFA Lincoln-Douglas into the larger individual events competitive framework, better equipping students for real-world argumentation.

First, Lincoln-Douglas was created for the specific purpose of creating a break from the practices of NDT and CEDA. The NFA wanted to create opportunities for students to debate in an environment that prized oratorical substance over the quantity of evidence. As the activity has grown, it has become clear that a desire exists to treat Lincoln-Douglas as an individual event unto itself. To use the same judging philosophies and norms that dominate the organizations that the activity initially rejected is to deny the individuality that the founders of the activity were attempting to achieve.

Second, Lincoln-Douglas cannot be effectively integrated into the competitive individual events tournament scheme so long as it is viewed as a traditional debate activity. To maintain such a status for it would require the creation of either two separate judging pools or the education of individual events judges in the ways of policy debating. Absent such steps, the activity would be perpetually relegated to inferior status as coaches, students, and judges struggled to define their identity in an activity with no clearly defined home. First and foremost participants in this activity need to accept that Lincoln-Douglas debate is now a popular and integral
part of the National Forensic Association and that it offers important training for debaters who wish to someday apply their skills in real world situations.

The critical listener model for Lincoln-Douglas debate would elevate the importance of subjective standards and those objective standards that have always been associated with good persuasion. For the judge, the experience of moving from a round of extemporaneous speaking, persuasion or rhetorical criticism to a round of Lincoln-Douglas debate should be a relatively seamless transition with little need for a stark paradigm shift. This may mean diminishing the significance of logos and elevating the importance of ethos and pathos appeals, or it may still mean employing the traditional stock issues of debate but weighing subjective standards in determining whether individual issues are won or lost. In the end, however, this new found freedom will create opportunity for students to adapt to Lincoln-Douglas judges as they would in other competitive speaking events or real-world speaking situations. For both judge and competitor the playing field will be leveled.

IMPLEMENTATION

Adopting the critical listener perspective would affect the practice of NFA Lincoln-Douglas on at least three levels: the NFA organization, Lincoln-Douglas judges, and Lincoln-Douglas competitors. First, NFA and its members must avoid the gross proliferation of rules for Lincoln-Douglas debate. While the process of altering the so-called "blue book" over the past few years has been healthy, micro-managing the activity could just as easily become its downfall as judges find it more difficult to keep up with all of the new requirements of the process. We must observe that every other individual event is described by the association in one to two sentences. The Lincoln-Douglas rules are now numbered in pages. For instance, the requirement that the stock issues paradigm be employed as the decision-making paradigm may be changed so as to simply "suggest" that the stock issues approach is a valid means of determining the issues in the round. The national organization can take the lead in encouraging the development of Lincoln-Douglas as a real world forensic event in which a wide
variety of decision-making processes are used by communicators.

Second, judges using the critical listener perspective should take a number of steps to insure that this judging philosophy serves a pedagogical function. Most importantly, judges should reward those competitors who are persuasive using the full range of persuasive tools available to them. Debaters who do not communicate in a "real world" fashion should be dropped in rounds. Judges may wish not to use the "flow sheet" method of debate evaluation, recognizing that being a good listener—as in any individual event—should be sufficient to test how well the message is received by the audience. In addition, judges should comment on all aspects of the debate: delivery, evidence, reasoning, etc. Considerable attention should be given on the ballot to offering suggestions for how the student can improve the rhetorical aspects of his or her performance. Finally, judges should consistently apply the critical listener perspective and not use debate paradigms sporadically. To make Lincoln-Douglas a traditional individual event, judges should promote a consistent judging philosophy.

Finally, students and coaches operating within this framework can take several steps that will increase not only their competitive success, but the educational value they achieve from the activity as well. Primarily, students should avoid replicating an NDT or CEDA style. While research is vitally important in Lincoln-Douglas, debaters should complement quantity of evidence with other, equally persuasive, appeals. Debaters should use emotional appeals, analysis, and commonly accepted truths in constructing their arguments. Debaters should avoid using debate jargon and should fully explain the implications of their statements and why their arguments are important. For example, instead of simply saying "T is a voter," the debater should explain that an affirmative case is beyond the scope of the resolution and is not fulfilling the initial requirements of debate.

In addition, students should use the same delivery skills they would use in a persuasion, prose, or impromptu round. The rate of the debater's speech has received considerable attention in the Lincoln-Douglas community, but very little attention has been paid to the other aspects of delivery. Debaters should avoid standing behind a desk, chair, or table. They should use eye contact with the
audience. Students should structure their speeches around main points, providing appropriate movement during transitions. Finally, debaters should adopt more of a narrative style in their speeches. Line-by-line refutation should be replaced with stories. Debaters should not be afraid to group arguments and argue in terms of issues, as opposed to arguments. For example, the debater would address the "harm" issue not in terms of individual items of evidence, but in terms of the overall persuasiveness of the issue.

Lincoln-Douglas debaters should present their speeches as they would in any other round. Skills such as effective delivery, audience adaptation, emotional persuasive appeals, and conceptual argumentation are highly valued in the individual events community. Lincoln-Douglas debate is uniquely situated to extend the use of these important skills to students who are interested in the practice of argument. In short, the critical listener perspective will better prepare Lincoln-Douglas debaters for effective real-world argumentation and allow the activity to achieve its pedagogical goals.

SUMMARY

Lincoln-Douglas debate offers National Forensic Association competitors several distinct lessons; the event emphasizes research, analysis, and refutation. However, the current state of Lincoln-Douglas does not allow for the full potential of the event to be realized. As currently practiced, Lincoln-Douglas resembles NDT or CEDA debate. Debaters do not use the presentational skills or emotional arguments in Lincoln-Douglas that they do in other individual events and judges are divided in their evaluation of the Lincoln-Douglas debate round. We have argued that current confusion about the activity is a result of widely disparate philosophies. Given the unique context of NFA Lincoln-Douglas, a new perspective is needed, the critical listener perspective.

The critical listener perspective, we contend, merges the demands of traditional debate with the philosophy of the National Forensic Association, its coaches and competitors. The perspective recognizes the need for evidence and analysis while at the same time embracing the rhetorical aspects of individual events. The critical
listener perspective, if adopted by students and judges, would result in a communicative activity which teaches students how to use not only evidence, but emotion and credibility in persuading audiences.
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