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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Debate activities hold an important position in most college and university extracurricular activity programs. Debate is an activity which involves an extensive amount of work and time on the part of both the participants and the faculty. Some teachers feel that the time spent on debate activities is excessive in terms of the educational value received by the student. Writers in the field of speech have frequently discussed the value of debate to the college student. For example:

The proponents of debate tell us that it is an admirable form of speech activity for training students to think clearly and quickly, to collect and sift facts, to acquire poise and adaptability in public speaking, and to achieve ease and power in talking to an audience. Those of us who feel that debating as it now exists in some places is a dangerous and often antisocial form of activity, point out that debate tends to develop in students an attitude of exhibitionism, to foster glibness and insincerity, and to put undue stress upon the element of competition and the desire to win at all costs. Either one of these sets of things may happen and anyone who has had any experience with student debate must be aware that at times each has happened. To some of us, it seems, however, that from debating as conducted at present, the undesirable results are more likely to occur than the desirable.¹

Other writers reach a quite different conclusion. The example that follows is representative of those who believe that the value of

debate outweighs its limitations.

The greatest number of sponsors of Pi Kappa Delta Chapters reported the belief that the following possible effects of debate training and experience were observed as being generally true: aids in personality development, provides recreational opportunities, develops respect for the opinions of others, increases knowledge of the use of the library, increases self-confidence, develops a broad knowledge of numerous subjects, increases ability to distinguish between the important and the unimportant, prepares students to accept leadership, increases the use of reason rather than emotion, promotes effective speech habits, heightens ability to think clearly and rapidly, develops methodical reasoning, develops the ability to weigh evidence without prejudice, and focuses diffuse knowledge and information.

The greatest number of sponsors of Pi Kappa Delta Chapters reported the belief that the following possible effects of debate training and experience were observed as being seldom true: develops a contentious nature, increases frustrations and tensions, develops insincerity, causes appeals to intolerance, debate becomes an exercise in sophistry, promotes dishonesty, influences debaters to listen for arguments that can be altered or misrepresented, provides opportunities to use persuasion to injurious limits, encourages speakers to debate on what they believe to be the wrong side of the question, and stereotypes the individual as an "intellectual." 2

Such comments as the two above have been made primarily by debate coaches and teachers in the field of speech. It appears that no serious attempt has been made to gather student opinion on this controversy. A search of pertinent literature suggests that only a few studies dealing with student opinion on this question, such as Braden's, have been completed. 3 Thus, the objective of this study was

---


to secure the opinions of former college debate students concerning
the values and limitations of debate. The major question was, what
benefits, if any, have graduates of South Dakota State College received
from their participation in a college debate program?

The following sequence was used in completing the study.

First, journals in the field of speech were examined for articles
on the values and limitations of debate. Second, a summary of this
literature was completed as a basis for compiling a survey-questionnaire.
Third, a questionnaire was designed. Fourth, copies were sent to
graduates of South Dakota State College who had earned membership in
Pi Kappa Delta, national honorary speech fraternity. Fifth, the results
were compiled. Sixth, the resulting information provided a basis for
conclusions and interpretations.

It is hoped that this study will help to clarify the question of
the value of debate training for the individual debater.
CHAPTER II

SUMMARY OF LITERATURE

The purpose of this chapter was (1) to review the literature concerned with the problem, and (2) to provide items to be used in the questionnaire. Twenty-one articles concerned with the value of debate to the individual debater were summarized, these articles being taken from *The Speech Teacher, Speech Monographs, The Quarterly Journal of Speech*, and *The Forensic*.

The chapter is organized as follows: (1) a bibliographical reference of the article is given; (2) a report of the article is given stating (a) its purpose and (b) the value or limitations that are attributed to participation in debate.

The articles are listed (1) chronologically according to the date of publication; and (2) articles with the same date of publication are listed alphabetically by author's names.

In this article Mr. Mosher discusses the contention, periodically made by many educators, that debate has no place in a college curriculum and should be replaced by discussion. He points out that both discussion and debate have their functions in life, but in no way can discussion replace debate. The author states that, whereas discussion develops the following seven values, only debate training can develop them to a significant degree:

1. Debate is good practice in extemporaneous speaking.
2. Debate provides an increase of useful information.
3. Debate draws out knowledge of individuals.
4. Debate cultivates ability to express ideas.
5. Debate provides mental training to keep the mind from being satisfied with fragmentary ideas, from vacillating, from straying into incoherencies, irrelevancies, and fallacies of reasoning.
6. Debate teaches students to seek the "truth".
7. Debate develops leadership.

Mr. Ewbank's article includes (1) a brief examination of the history of speech contests, (2) an inspection of these contests in the light of current trends in curriculum building, and (3) an examination of some of the complaints that have been filed against them.

Mr. Ewbank concludes that speech contests do have educational value and gives these reasons:

1. They are situations which start from the students' main interest and work toward more remote goals.
2. They are situations which demand marked activity on the part of the students.
3. They are situations and projects which resemble desirable life situations as nearly as possible.
4. They are situations and projects which challenge the student to put forth his best efforts.
5. They are situations and projects which test the student's ability to synthesize materials drawn from various sources.

Mayer states that an objective of debating can be personality development. In this article are delineated nine personality traits developed through debating:

1. Self-control
2. Sportsmanship
3. Judgment
4. Co-operation
5. Initiative
6. Courage
7. Tact
8. Honesty
9. Leadership

In his article Mr. Smith contends that debaters are not only leaders in school, but also that "they will be leaders in their professions and their community life after they leave school." He further contends that "debate is a liberal education. It trains the student in all things that are vital to successful participation in modern American life."

The author draws these conclusions:

1. A debater learns to talk convincingly and conversationally.
2. A debater learns to analyze statements.
3. A debater learns to search for facts.
4. A debater learns to be open-minded in regard to another's opinion.
5. A debater learns from the decisions for and against him.
6. A debater learns to be a true sportsman.

The purpose of Mr. Thoassen's article is to re-evaluate discussion and debate. He feels that periodic evaluation is necessary in order to determine if "our work is consistent with sound educational practice."

The author assumes that discussion and debate are a unit, but that discussion precedes debate. Mr. Thoassen expresses the opinion that discussion and debate make the following contributions to the student and the social group:

1. Temper the judgments of students.
2. Make students more tolerant and responsible members in the presence of conflicting ideas.
3. Remove most emotional barriers to rational conduct.
4. Remove some ulterior designs and persuasive cunning in some men's reasoning.
5. Make the student open-minded.
"The major premise of this article is that debates should be carried on as an educational activity and not as gladiatorial bouts ..." Mr. Ridgway states some considerations which he believes "to be basic in guiding ... inter-school debating."

1. Debate should be as democratic as possible.

2. Debate should promote the current best standards in speaking.

3. Debate should aid in the attainment of the highest educational objectives, and be taught in accord with the best teaching techniques and objectives.

4. Debate should teach self-assurance, resourcefulness, and effectiveness as a speaker.

5. Debate should teach ease of manner and bearing in relationship with others.

6. Debate should develop a spirit of co-operation and good sportsmanship.

7. Debate should teach practice in selection, evaluation, and organization of a large body of material, which practice constitutes a type of thinking and a valuable academic device.

8. Debate should afford information on public affairs.

9. Debate should broaden the social perspective of the debater.

The thesis of this article is that "debating is debating" and not "a fourth type of discussion...that can be employed only after a great deal of preliminary discussion has taken place." The purpose of the article, as stated by Mr. Hellman, is "to take issue generally with the current group of enthusiasts for group discussion who conceive it as something basic among speech activities and before which debate must bow respectfully and retire to a seat in the back row or bow out entirely ...."

The author discusses these significant items:

1. Debate is not a game or a contest.
2. Debate is an exercise in sophistry to a small degree.
3. Debate is teaching; it is an exercise in persuasion.
4. Debate is investigative.
5. Debate is more than just an exercise in public speaking.
6. Debate is more than just an exercise for stimulating research.

The purpose of this study was to determine if "outstanding performance in speech is usually accompanied by certain factors of personal or mental make-up not necessarily found in students doing average or inferior work."

Within the limitations of the study "it can be stated tentatively that there is positive correlation between speech superiority and the following characteristics:

1. High achievement in oral speech courses.
2. High scholarship in academic fields.
3. Extensive participation in high school and college activities both within and without the speech field.
5. Dominance and self-confidence.
6. A broad knowledge of literature.
7. Above average reading ability.
8. Less need than other students for self-support.
Bradon, Waldo W., "What Happens to Debaters and Why", The
Forensic, series 44, no. 4, 107, Pi Kappa Delta: Hollywood, California,
May, 1949.

Mr. Braden's article contains a list of currently prominent men
who participated in debate while in school. He states that "former
students are most enthusiastic in endorsing the activity ... they say
that it helped them in their careers and that it aided them in taking
a prominent place in civic life." The author lists six elements of
intercollegiate debating which seem to explain its influence on persons
in business, law, government and other lines of endeavor:

1. Intercollegiate debating attracts students with superior
   intelligence.

2. Intercollegiate debating develops an intense interest in
   public affairs.

3. Intercollegiate debating creates a great desire to improve.

4. Intercollegiate debating throws the participant into
   competition with other bright students.

5. Intercollegiate debating teaches the student how to
   analyze, to think critically, and to listen.

6. Intercollegiate debating develops the ability to extemporize,
   to express thoughts clearly and fluently under pressure.

In this article Mr. Ewbank says, "Discussion and debate are not merely extracurricular activities or courses in a curriculum. They are the essential tools of a democratic society." Throughout the article the author gives evidence to support this thesis and to evolve the following conclusions:

1. Debaters have the qualities needed for leadership; they are much better than average students; they rank higher than non-debaters in ability to evaluate evidence, analyze arguments, and draw logical conclusions.

2. Debaters hold positions of prominence after graduation.

3. Debaters learn much of value from their debating experience.

4. Debaters out-gain non-debaters in ability to think critically.

5. Students in college argumentation courses usually gain more in critical thinking ability than similar students gain from other courses.

6. Debating is a responsibility.

7. Debating produces few radicals and reactionaries; debaters tend to see both sides of a question.

The purpose of this article is to stimulate thinking on the purpose of forensic programs. The author feels that too many programs measure their success by the "number of cups in the trophy case." Mr. Ehninger is more interested in the "contributions which the program makes toward the intellectual, social, and moral development of the students who participate in it."

The author considers these six "earmarks" to be important:

1. A sound forensics program is integrated with curricular instruction in public speaking and the fundamentals of speech.

2. A sound forensics program is student-centered.

3. In a sound forensics program, participation is regulated by educationally defensible principles.
   a. Participation is spread among as many students as can be given thorough training and a reasonable amount of experience.....
   b. Training in debate and discussion must in no way interfere with the student's general academic achievements.
   c. Participation in forensics should constitute but one part of a well-rounded program of co-curricular activities.

4. A sound forensics program teaches social responsibility.

5. A sound forensics program is progressive.
   a. Takes advantage of debate organizations and leagues.
   b. Provides experience in all the more common forms of argumentative deliberation.
c. Gives each student one or more opportunities to appear before a real audience in a situation which includes a question period.

d. Uses current affairs topics to broaden student's knowledge.

e. Follows all decision and non-decision events by critiques.

6. A sound forensics program is respected in the school, the community, and the region of the country in which it is carried on.

Mr. Schug states that the purpose of this study "was to determine, specifically, the attitude toward debate on the part of secondary school and college administrators and officials, as well as college teachers in related subject matter areas, outside the field of speech and debate. The attitude of these respective groups is significant, not only because some of their members have already spoken out against debate from time to time, but also because most of them, if not all, are in a position to bring considerable pressure to bear upon the elimination of debate from the academic scene on the one hand, or on the other, upon the elevation of debate to a more dignified and academically accepted position than it now holds."

Sampling of secondary schools was limited to the state of Pennsylvania; for the colleges, sampling included all sections of the country.

A questionnaire, composed in part of sixty statements of attitude toward debate, was mailed to 300 participants. "These sixty statements were culled from an original list of 174, of which 106 ranged from the neutral, or near-neutral, position to the extremely unfavorable position; and of which 68 ranged from the neutral, or near-neutral, position to the position of extreme favorableness."
Listed below are the statements which the author believed showed the most meaningful results. The percentage following each statement indicates the per cent of participants agreeing with the statement.

**Statements favorable to debate:**

1. Experience gained by participation in a well-coached debate program is all profit. 45%
2. There is far more good than bad to be derived from contest debating. 62%
3. The democratic process demands training in reasoned advocacy, as well as in reasoned investigation. 72%
4. The successful debater learns more library investigation, note-taking, orderly classification, and "handling data" than any other undergraduate could possible learn from all the classes in the curriculum. 29%
5. Debate recognizes the right of another to hold a different opinion. 61%
6. Most debaters, I believe, construct their own cases and write their own speeches. 24%
7. Debaters nearly always speak honestly and sincerely. 24%

**Neutral or near-neutral statements:**

1. Present methods of judging debates are satisfactory. 21%
2. Tournament debating should be supplanted by audience debating. 29%
3. I object to the practice of those coaches who arbitrarily assign debaters to sides. 31%
4. Spreading participation to the many is preferable to concentrating on securing a high percentage of wins by limiting participation to the few. 55%
5. The cross-examination style of debate is better training for the debater and is more interesting to the audience than the orthodox style. 58%
6. The orthodox style of debate is better training for
the debater and is more interesting to the audience
than the cross-examination style. 5%

7. Wins and losses should be de-emphasized in favor of
a system of quality rating. 61%

Statements unfavorable to debate:

1. Debate is not conducive to honest thinking. 10%

2. Debaters manufacture evidence - have little regard
   for the actual facts. 11%

3. Debaters and coaches strive to win at any cost. 18%

4. Debaters too often indulge in trickery and the
twisting of evidence to serve their purposes. 21%

5. Preparation too often consists of memorizing dis-
cussion previously written by the coach or some
"shark." 29%

6. Debaters all too frequently look upon debate merely
as a game - intellectual sport - and have little
interest in presenting a practical solution to the
problem at hand. 34%

7. The policy of training a few to be stars rather than
training many for active participation cannot be
condoned as sound educational practice. 36%

8. Coaches are frequently guilty of dictating the
team's case. 39%

9. Debate needs coaches with better training and a
more wholesome philosophy of debate. 69%
The purpose of Mr. Shepard's article is to examine some of the most common objections to debate. He gives the basis for each objection, discusses the justification, if any, for the objection, then attempts to disprove each.

The objections are:

1. Debate is immoral, for debaters not only argue against their convictions but they are unethical.

2. Debaters suppress evidence, ignore sources, and rely on name-calling and over-simplification.

3. Coaches take too much time, effort, and money for too few students.

4. The topics used for debate are out-dated and of no benefit to the debaters.

Mr. Shepard states that "...the conclusion to be drawn from all this is that the objectors to debate have set up impossible goals for the college debater. If it is immoral for a debater to argue against his convictions, it follows that his convictions must be based upon definitive research, upon the ultimate truth. These perfect debaters would have no need for participating in debate, or for entering the university, or for that matter, for remaining on earth..."

In his article Carroll C. Arnold examines "the case against speech." He states that the roots of the argument against speech participation will be found in two general "convictions or premises": (1) "Speech is a special subject, chiefly remedial or artistic, and is, therefore, important only to the seriously deficient and the especially gifted; or (2) Speech is not a true subject at all but an assortment of special activities which may be properly and adequately provided outside the regular academic schedule."

He continues, "...it is important to observe that both of these assumptions involve an identification of speech with dramatics, voice and diction, declamation, speech correction, debate, or other fragments and special activities connected with our general discipline."

The author refutes each of these assumptions and concludes that "it is to our place in general education rather than to the expansion of our specialties that our friends, the critics, bid us attend, as we assume responsibility for the future progress of speech education."

The purpose of this study was an attempt to determine "precisely what were the major characteristics or attributes of the successful intercollegiate debater." A questionnaire was evolved which was composed of fifty positive statements based upon examination of texts, informal conversation with other debate coaches, and the writer's personal opinions. The questionnaire was sent to fifty coaches in all sections of the country.

The coaches were requested to indicate separately the five most important characteristics of debaters in rough order of their importance. They found the five items below to be most frequently selected:

1. They have high I.Q.'s, generally above 120.
2. They tend to have considerable interest in public affairs and events.
3. They tend to have a facility or ability to organize in writing and speaking.
4. They tend to be superior in ability to extemporize.
5. They tend to have "good" personalities.

The writing of this article stemmed from the controversy over the educational value of tournament debating. "The defenders have called attention to the many notable educational values.... On the other hand, some critics have opposed the debate tournament as well as all training in debate." The authors made a careful examination of the sort of activity promoted by tournament debating. Their study tends to reveal both the educational possibilities and the educational limitations of such debating.

The educational values of tournament debating are listed thus:

1. Tournament debating is an efficient way of giving a reasonable number of college students of all degrees of speech proficiency sustained, repeated practice in oral argument.

2. Because of the significant audience of an "expert" judge the student's skills in the use of evidence and reasoning are apt to be uniquely developed.

3. Tournament debate cultivates skill in oral argument which may make a significant contribution to the purpose of American higher education.

The limitations of tournament debating are reduced to the following observation: "The skills developed in tournament debating do not comprise the whole of the rhetorical skills needed by a student for effective
participation in the public address of American society."

The authors drew these specific conclusions from the analysis:

1. Debate coaches should study the problem of determining the optimum amount of tournament debating which ought to be given students of varying levels of ability in oral argument.

2. The forensic director should consider ways of diversifying the type of speaking opportunities available to his students.

3. The fact that students have achieved proficiency in the competitive advocacy of tournament debating does not, in itself, qualify these students for appearance in public debates before general audiences.

4. Debate tournaments which emphasize the bringing together of the "best" college debaters of the country for the purpose of declaring "super-champions" might well be viewed skeptically with regard to the contribution they make to speech education.

This article reported the results of a questionnaire study designed (1) to discover how much training in the areas of discussion and debate law students actually receive in their college and professional education, and (2) to ascertain the attitudes of educators toward these areas.

The results showed lack of these courses in the lawyers' education and training, but a very definite belief in their importance.

Of particular significance to this thesis is the following list of recommendations of the Association of American Law Schools for prelegal education.

1. Research: awareness of sources and types of material, adaptation to particular use, methods of fact presentation.

2. Fact completeness: willingness to recognize all facts, avoidance of preconception and fiction masquerading as fact, disciplined ability to withhold judgment until all facts are "in".

3. Fact differentiation: relevance of facts to particular issues, varying importance of different facts, relative persuasiveness.

4. Fact marshalling: reduction of masses of fact to manageable proportions, arrangement of facts in logical and convincing order.

5. Deductive reasoning: use of the syllogism, spotting logical fallacies, avoiding conclusions flowing from inaccurate premises.
6. Inductive reasoning: experimental methodology, accuracy of observation, elimination of variables, role of hypotheses, conditions essential to valid generalization such as adequacy of sampling, and strict limitation of conclusions by available reliable data.


8. Critical analysis: disciplined skepticism in approach, thoroughness of inquiry, keenness of mind in cutting through to essentials.


10. Power of decisions: resolution of discoverable issues in the light of short- and long-term ends found preferable on explicitly identified and justified grounds.

The Association urges the pre-law student "to develop proficiency in his undergraduate career in the area of 'creative power in thinking.'

...The similarity between this listing of skills and the study programs in group discussion and argumentation courses is impressive."
James F. Harding, Jr., is a trial attorney for the Civil Division of the United States Department of Justice. In his article, he considers the particular aspects of his undergraduate training in debate which he believes gave him the most valuable background for his present occupation. He reaches these conclusions:

1. Training in debate helped to develop "cold clear logic."

2. Training in debate helped to develop good organization.

3. Training in debate helped to develop the techniques of timing, clarity of expression, and emphasis.

4. Training in debate helped to develop research and organization of material.

5. Training in debate developed the ability to think on one's feet and speak fluently and spontaneously.

6. Training in debate developed the ability to think and speak or listen at the same time.

7. Training in debate developed "mental stamina"; one learns to "take it" for long hours at a time.

8. Training in debate developed sportsmanship.

This study was conducted in an endeavor to determine the objectives and possible effects of debate. "Objectives" were defined as the end results toward which efforts have been directed by the debate coach and debater. "Possible effects" were defined as the end results that have been produced by an action or cause (i.e., effort toward the objectives), as reported by sponsors of Pi Kappa Delta.

Sponsors of Pi Kappa Delta were chosen for the population in this questionnaire study. A questionnaire was sent to each of the one hundred and seventy-three chapters listed in the national secretary’s directory for October, 1955. The questionnaire consisted of two parts: "(1) a list of seven objectives of debate derived from debate tests, personal experience and consultation with debate coaches, and (2) twenty-eight possible effects of debate training and experiences, which had been previously judged to be either advantageous or disadvantageous for the student."

Within limitations noted in the article, the cumulative results of the questionnaires filled out by the 128 sponsors of Pi Kappa Delta forensic programs returning the questionnaire are listed below.
Objectives of debate training:

1. Promote and/or heighten skill in critical thinking and analysis, in reasoning, and in synthesis of logical argument.

2. Promote greater skill in oral communication - the ability to present material clearly and effectively.

3. Develop critical listening and evaluation of arguments presented by others.

4. Promote research--discovering, selecting, and evaluating material.

5. Develop ability to think quickly.

6. Develop co-operation within a framework of competitive team endeavor.

7. Cultivate social growth and development.

Possible effects of debate training:

1. Aids in personality development.

2. Provides recreational opportunities.

3. Develops respect for the opinions of others.

4. Increases knowledge of the use of the library.

5. Increases self-confidence.

6. Develops a broad knowledge of numerous subjects.

7. Increases ability to distinguish between the important and the unimportant.

8. Prepares students to accept leadership.

9. Increases the use of reason rather than emotion.

10. Promotes effective speech habits.

11. Heightens ability to think clearly and rapidly.

12. Develops methodical reasoning.

13. Develops the ability to weigh evidence without prejudice.

14. Focuses diffuse knowledge and information.
Occasionally true of debate training:

1. Develops aggressiveness.
2. Aids in developing high ideals.
3. Winning becomes the primary motive.

Seldom true of debate training:

1. Develops a contentious nature.
2. Increases frustrations and tensions.
3. Develops insincerity.
4. Causes appeals to intolerance.
5. Debate becomes an exercise in sophistry.
6. Promotes dishonesty.
7. Influences debaters to listen for arguments that can be altered or misrepresented.
8. Provides opportunities to use persuasion to an injurious degree.
9. Encourages speakers to debate on what they believe to be the wrong side of the question, and stereotypes the individual as an "intellectual".

Never true of debate training:

1. Decreases the student's popularity on the campus.

This article is the text of an address delivered before the Grand Forks Kiwanis Club on Wednesday, November 22, 1933. A letter from the author to The Forensic explains the reason for the article's being printed in the March, 1957, issue. Dr. Schrier writes: "I went through my voluminous files recently and ran onto a speech I had delivered as long ago as November 22, 1933. As I indulged in the doubtful luxury of spending time reading it, the thought did occur to me that the points made in defense of intercollegiate debating and citizenship were as relevant today as twenty-three years ago."

The advantages of debating as seen by Dr. Schrier are as follows:

1. A college debater gains an intelligent and continuing interest in current affairs.


3. A college debater learns to detect emotionalism in politics.

4. A college debater learns to acquire the proper attitude toward controversial questions; he recognizes that there is much to be said on both sides of any debatable question.

The question of the academic merit of intercollegiate debating was the basis for this study. "In an attempt to investigate one phase of this problem, this project was designed to determine to what extent, if any, judgments in tournament debating are related to academic or educational values."

A selected group of thirty-four "qualified" judges at the Heart of America Tournament at the University of Kansas in March, 1957, were asked to take part in the study. The judges were furnished with a questionnaire ballot for each round of debate judged. This ballot included the seven items which are listed on the following page. Judges were asked to rate each team in relation to each of the criteria on a scale from one to fifteen. A total of 175 judgments of tournament debaters were analyzed and tabulated. "The results of this analysis indicate that judges at this tournament gave approximately ninety-seven per cent of their consideration in arriving at their decisions to criteria which are identifiable with what are generally considered to be desirable academic goals."

Of particular interest to this thesis is the following comment by Mr. Giffin which includes a list of the criteria which appeared on the questionnaire.
It is generally agreed that the abilities that relate to the following objectives are academically desirable, agreed upon not only by people interested in our co-curricular debate program, but by many other college and university professors and shown by the numerous courses and curricula that emphasize one or more of these objectives:

1. To teach students to speak well; that is, to have better "delivery", including good voice usage and appropriate posture and gestures;

2. To give students greater ability to determine logically defensible arguments relative to propositions or intellectual positions which they favor;

3. To encourage students to be able to support positions held with pertinent and carefully documented factual information;

4. To help students to perceive irrational, facetious, or irrelevant arguments advanced by other people;

5. To teach students to phrase their concepts in clear and concise language;

6. To increase students' abilities to analyze problems, i.e., to select groups of related concepts and issues; and,

7. To help students to achieve better organization of concepts which are related.
CHAPTER III

PROCEDURE

In this chapter the procedure and materials used in the study will be discussed. The chapter consists of two parts: (1) the questionnaire, and (2) tabulation.

The survey of literature, summarized in chapter II, provides some details concerning the conflict over the value of debate. There are those authors who write only of the value of debate, those who write only of the limitations of debate, and those who discuss both the value and limitations of debate. The majority of the articles were written by members of the speech profession who have worked with or observed debate. It would appear to follow, then, that the articles should provide a reasonable basis for determining which items might be included in a questionnaire designed to measure participant attitude concerning debate.

The Questionnaire

The questionnaire consisted of two parts. The first part was designed to secure certain general information about each respondent. These questions located at the top of page one required each respondent to state his occupation, sex, age, and year graduated from South Dakota State College. The purpose of this information was to secure categories that could be used in making tabulation comparisons.

Respondents were first asked to indicate the amount of education beyond the Bachelor's level. Categories used were zero to nine months,
ten to twenty months, and more than twenty months. The respondents were asked then to indicate which years they had participated in debate—none, freshman, sophomore, junior, or senior years. The "none" category was included to account for those persons who may have earned membership in Pi Kappa Delta through participation in original oratory and may never have taken part in intercollegiate debate. Replies from such individuals are not included in the tabulation of results.

Finally, using a five-point scale of much less, less, average, more, and much more, the respondents were asked to indicate how much they had participated in debate in relation to other debaters.

The second part of the questionnaire consisted of thirty-six statements about debate. The respondents were asked to indicate their degree of agreement or disagreement with each statement according to an attitude scale of (1) strongly disagree, (2) disagree, (3) uncertain, (4) agree, and (5) strongly agree. After an examination of attitude scales used in similar studies, this particular scale was selected.4

The statements which appeared on the questionnaire were based on the literature surveyed in chapter II. The first step in the process was to eliminate all statements which were not relevant to the study. Statements which included self-judgment—those statements which an individual cannot or does not wish to make about himself—were excluded.

---

Such statements were, "debaters tend to have good personalities," 5 "debate attracts students with superior intelligence," 6 "debate stereotypes the individual as an intellectual," 7 and "debate challenges the student to put forth his best efforts." 8 Statements pertaining to the coaching of debate or to the debate coach directly were also considered irrelevant. Examples of such statements include "coaches need better training and a more wholesome philosophy of debate," 9 tournament debating should be supplanted by audience debating," 10 and "a sound forensics program is integrated with curricular instruction in public speaking and the fundamentals of speech." 11

The second step in the sifting process was to eliminate all statements which were duplications. Following are examples of some of


10 Ibid.

the duplications: debate provides practice in extemporaneous speaking; debate develops the ability to express oneself; debate teaches sportsmanship; debate teaches one to analyze arguments; debate teaches quick thinking; and debate makes one insincere. These or similar statements appeared in one or more articles.

The third step was to combine related statements which did not contradict or duplicate in meaning. Some of these statements also appeared in several articles. These statements were combined: teaches one critical and evaluative listening; teaches one to be poised and self-confident; develops the ability to extemporize and express thoughts clearly; and has occupational value (helps in securing and advancing in a job).

When this process was completed, thirty-six statements remained; eighteen stated values of debate, and eighteen stated limitations of debate. In order to guard against slanting the questionnaire, an equal number of favorable and unfavorable statements was used. The statements were arranged without pattern, in order to avoid the possibility of patterned response by the respondents. The initial questionnaire which resulted can be found in Appendix I, page 78.

A number of changes, corrections, and/or additions were suggested. A compilation of all suggestions made is to be found in Appendix I, page 83. The suggestions were considered and a number of changes made. A copy of the final questionnaire appears on page 86 of Appendix II. A complete list of all people who had earned membership in Pi Kappa Delta from 1920 (when South Dakota State College received its charter) to 1957
was secured from the national secretary. The records of the alumni office of South Dakota State College were checked to secure the addresses of all those who had graduated from this institution. Of the 258 members, 116 had either not graduated from South Dakota State College or the alumni office had no record of their addresses. This left 142 individuals to whom the questionnaire could be sent.

The questionnaires were given code marks in order to determine which had been returned. After ten days a follow-up letter (Appendix II, page 90) and a second copy of the questionnaire were mailed to those who had not yet replied.

Ninety-eight, or 69.1 per cent, of the questionnaires were finally returned. A complete list of those individuals to whom the questionnaire was sent is included in Appendix II, page 91. Those persons whose names are marked with an asterisk returned the questionnaire.

Tabulation

The information from the questionnaires was punched on IBM cards. Raw totals in three categories were tabulated so that these categories might be used for comparison. The three areas were (1) year graduated from South Dakota State College, (2) the amount of education beyond

---

12D. J. Nabors, National Secretary-Treasurer of Pi Kappa Delta, East Central State College, Ada, Oklahoma, 1958.
the Bachelor's level, and (3) the amount of participation in debate.

These data were then transferred to tables which gave (1) raw data, (2) means, and (3) significance of the differences. The total number of answers is not the same in all instances since not all respondents answered every item of the questionnaire.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The purpose of this chapter is to present the results of the questionnaire survey. It includes (1) tables showing the characteristics of the respondents, (2) tables showing the respondents' opinions on the questions asked, and (3) explanations of these tables.

In the remainder of this thesis the terms "favorable statements toward debate" and "unfavorable statements toward debate" will be used. The favorable statements referred to are items 17, 18, 19, 22, 23, 25, 26, 29, 31, 32, 33, 35, 39, 41, 43, 46, 48, and 49. The unfavorable statements referred to are items 20, 21, 24, 27, 28, 30, 34, 36, 37, 38, 40, 42, 44, 45, 47, 50, 51, and 52. Favorable statements are those which denote value of debate. Unfavorable statements are those which denote the ill effects of debate.

Favorable and unfavorable statements were either separated in each table, or a separate table was made for each. Statement numbers were given on all but one table; on this table a shortened version of the statement was made. Reference to the questionnaire in the Appendix II, page 86, will provide the original statement.

Occupation

Occupations of the respondents were largely professional. Table I shows the occupations listed in order of frequency with the number of individuals in each occupational area. Twenty-one of the ninety-eight
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewife</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, Extension, Home Ec.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineer</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Government</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalist</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawyer</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banker</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Officer</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physician</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentist</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacist</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Worker</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
respondents were teachers or professors. This profession accounted for the largest single group. Housewives accounted for the second largest group, with thirteen. All other areas had seven or fewer.

Year Graduated

Table II indicates the year of graduation from South Dakota State College and the number for each year. Three individuals did not give the year of graduation. The greatest number in any one year was six, which occurred in 1942 and in 1950.

Age

The age distribution of the respondents is shown in Table III. The youngest respondent was twenty-four, the eldest seventy-two. Three individuals did not give their ages.

Sixty-one percent of the individuals ranged in age from twenty-four to forty-five. The remaining thirty-nine percent ranged in age from forty-six to seventy-two.

Sex

Twenty-four women and seventy-four men returned the questionnaire. No calculations were made to show the relationship between the sex of the individual and his attitude toward debate.
### TABLE II. YEAR OF GRADUATION FROM SOUTH DAKOTA STATE COLLEGE SHOWING THE NUMBER PER YEAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1942</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1927</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1928</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE III. AGE DISTRIBUTION OF THE RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Raw Data

Table IV shows the tabulation of raw data on questions concerning the values and limitations of debate. The numbers listed under each attitude category represent the total number of respondents who answered the statements in that particular way. The reject column includes those answers which were not marked or were marked with a number that did not appear on the attitude scale.

Determination of Means for Entire Sample

Table V shows the mean for each favorable statement as determined for the entire population. The statements are arranged in rank order from the statement showing the greatest amount of agreement to the statement showing the least amount of agreement. Item number eighteen, "teaches one to analyze arguments", the mean of which was 4.34, had the highest rank for favorable items. Item number twenty-nine, "develops avid reading habits in current affairs," the mean of which was 3.47, had the lowest rank of the favorable statements. The mean for all favorable statements was 3.89.

Table VI shows the mean for each unfavorable statement as determined for the entire population. Item number fifty-two, "has no educational value," the mean of which was 1.35, had the greatest amount of disagreement. Item number twenty-four, "makes one argumentative," the mean of which was 2.79, had the least amount of disagreement. The mean for all unfavorable statements was 2.02.
### Table IV. Raw Data Items 17-52

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Rejects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table V. Total Means for Favorable Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Favorable items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16  Teaches one to analyze arguments</td>
<td>4.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19  Teaches quick thinking</td>
<td>4.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23  Ability to extemporize and express thoughts</td>
<td>4.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32  Develops logical thinking</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22  Teaches critical and evaluative listening</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33  Detection of illogical proof</td>
<td>3.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26  Poise and self-confidence</td>
<td>3.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17  Interest in public affairs</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46  Knowledge about documentation</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49  Fosters intellectual curiosity</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48  Has occupational value</td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43  Recognize authorities</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39  Respect for others opinions</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41  Teaches one to recognize propaganda</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25  Continuing interest in public affairs</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31  Teaches one to take criticism well</td>
<td>3.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35  Thorough research</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29  Reading in current affairs</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average mean for all favorable items - 3.87
TABLE VI. TOTAL MEANS FOR UNFAVORABLE ITEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unfavorable items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52 Has no educational value</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 Fosters intolerance</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Makes one unethical</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Makes one insincere</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 Affects scholastic standing adversely</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 Exercise in memorization rather than thinking</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 Became an exercise in trickery</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 Makes one strongly impulsive</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Takes too much of the coach's time</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Costs are too great</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Takes too much of the student's time</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 Increases frustrations and tensions</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 Is too formal for research and reasoning</td>
<td>2.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 Makes one strongly opinionated</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 Teaches one to suppress evidence</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 Places too much stress on winning</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Makes one too aggressive</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Makes one argumentative</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average mean for all unfavorable items - 2.02
Year Graduated - Means

The years in which respondents were graduated from South Dakota State College were arbitrarily divided into three periods. The periods selected were 1920 through 1932, thirty-one persons; 1933 through 1945, twenty-three persons; and 1946 through 1957, thirty-nine persons.\textsuperscript{13} Table VII shows the raw data for each statement in the respective periods of time.

Table VIII shows the relationship between the favorable statements and time divisions. The mean was determined for each statement. The average mean was then determined for each of the three categories.

Table IX shows the relationship between the unfavorable statements and time divisions. The mean was determined for each statement. The average mean was then determined for each of the three categories.

Education - Means

Respondents were asked to indicate how much education they had received beyond the Bachelor's level. The questionnaire provided a breakdown in months: zero to nine, ten to twenty, or more than twenty. Tabulation of raw scores may be found in Table X.

Table XI shows the relationship between favorable statements and education beyond the Bachelor's level. The mean was determined for each

\textsuperscript{13}Two respondents did not give the year they graduated. One respondent was graduated in 1913, a second in 1914. They were apparently honorary members of Pi Kappa Delta.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>1920-1932</th>
<th></th>
<th>1933-1945</th>
<th></th>
<th>1946-1957</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0 2 5 19 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 1 4 15 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 2 7 22 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0 0 2 13 16</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 16 7</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 27 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0 0 3 17 11</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 1 1 13 8</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 1 3 21 14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>14 15 2 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>8 8 6 1 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>11 23 5 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>14 12 5 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>7 11 4 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>11 26 1 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>0 0 2 23 6</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 1 1 16 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 1 5 27 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>0 0 2 19 10</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 1 14 8</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 7 21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1 18 7 5 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 13 5 1 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 19 11 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>0 2 9 17 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 3 6 13 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 2 10 25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>0 0 4 21 6</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 3 18 1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 1 7 28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>9 17 4 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 14 3 0 1 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>9 19 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>5 20 4 1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 15 3 1 0 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>9 25 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>0 2 17 11 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 4 11 7 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 3 12 23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>7 17 6 0 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>7 11 3 1</td>
<td>0 1 10 19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>0 2 7 20 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 2 7 14 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 2 13 22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>0 0 4 18 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 1 21 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 1 5 30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>0 0 2 25 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 1 1 20 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 1 1 31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1 22 6 1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 15 4 3 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 26 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>0 2 10 17 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 3 6 12 1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 2 18 18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>3 19 8 0 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 5 5 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 23 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>9 15 6 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 16 1 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>9 23 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>9 17 5 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>10 10 3 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>17 21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>0 1 5 19 6</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 15 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 8 28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>12 15 4 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 12 5 0 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>7 25 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>0 1 9 21 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 1 4 16 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 1 11 26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>4 19 7 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 15 2 3 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>9 24 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>0 3 4 22 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 1 5 16 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 1 9 26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>6 21 4 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>7 13 1 1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>12 24 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>6 20 5 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 15 2 3 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>8 25 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>1 0 4 24 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 1 4 16 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 1 6 31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>9 18 4 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 14 4 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 34 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>0 3 9 15 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 1 4 14 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 2 9 24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>0 1 5 23 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 1 4 13 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 1 10 26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>4 20 5 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 11 6 3 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 22 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>10 17 3 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>7 14 2 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>11 19 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>20 9 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>18 5 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>29 9 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>1920 - 1932</td>
<td>1933 - 1945</td>
<td>1946 - 1957</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average mean 3.88 3.86 3.77
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>1920 - 1932</th>
<th>1933 - 1945</th>
<th>1946 - 1957</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>2.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average mean: 1.97 | 2.08 | 2.03
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>0 - 9 No.</th>
<th>10 - 20 No.</th>
<th>More than 20 No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 R</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0 3 4 27 8</td>
<td>0 0 7 11 3</td>
<td>0 2 5 19 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0 0 1 29 12</td>
<td>0 0 1 11 10</td>
<td>0 2 2 17 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0 3 2 24 13</td>
<td>0 0 2 13 7</td>
<td>0 3 14 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>11 23 7 1 0</td>
<td>10 9 2 0 0</td>
<td>12 15 4 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>12 25 3 2 0</td>
<td>11 8 2 0 0</td>
<td>9 17 5 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>2 4 31 4</td>
<td>0 0 2 15 4</td>
<td>0 0 2 20 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>0 0 3 26 13</td>
<td>0 0 3 12 6</td>
<td>0 0 4 16 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1 3 7 6 2</td>
<td>1 9 8 3 0</td>
<td>1 15 9 4 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>0 0 1 13 23</td>
<td>5 0 3 5 12 1</td>
<td>0 3 7 21 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1 0 7 30 4</td>
<td>0 0 2 17 2</td>
<td>0 0 5 21 4 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>13 20 7 2 0</td>
<td>6 12 2 0 1</td>
<td>5 17 8 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>8 27 3 3 1</td>
<td>7 13 0 1 0</td>
<td>3 19 8 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>0 3 16 19 4</td>
<td>0 3 17 7 0</td>
<td>0 3 14 15 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>11 21 8 1 1</td>
<td>8 7 4 2 0</td>
<td>6 19 5 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>0 0 1 3 2</td>
<td>4 0 4 7 10 0</td>
<td>0 1 13 15 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>0 0 1 31 5</td>
<td>2 0 4 17 4 0</td>
<td>0 0 5 20 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1 2 1 35 3</td>
<td>0 0 18 3 0</td>
<td>0 0 3 24 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>0 24 8 9 1</td>
<td>1 15 4 1 0</td>
<td>2 24 4 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>0 5 13 21 3</td>
<td>0 1 7 13 0</td>
<td>0 1 14 14 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>3 26 7 4 2</td>
<td>2 13 3 3 0</td>
<td>3 15 12 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>9 23 6 3 1</td>
<td>7 13 1 0 0</td>
<td>6 17 6 2 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>12 24 6 0 0</td>
<td>10 10 1 0 0</td>
<td>13 16 2 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>2 3 6 29 2</td>
<td>0 2 3 13 3</td>
<td>0 0 7 21 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>8 28 3 2 1</td>
<td>7 9 5 0 0</td>
<td>8 16 6 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>0 0 1 27 1</td>
<td>0 0 2 19 0</td>
<td>0 2 9 18 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>8 24 5 5 0</td>
<td>5 14 2 0 0</td>
<td>5 19 5 2 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>0 4 7 29 2</td>
<td>0 2 3 15 1</td>
<td>0 0 7 23 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>7 29 5 0 1</td>
<td>8 12 1 0 0</td>
<td>10 17 3 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>4 25 7 6 0</td>
<td>5 13 2 0 1</td>
<td>6 21 4 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>0 1 8 31 2</td>
<td>1 1 1 18 0</td>
<td>0 0 5 23 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>4 31 6 1 0</td>
<td>6 14 1 0 0</td>
<td>6 22 3 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>0 4 10 24 5 1</td>
<td>2 6 10 3 0</td>
<td>0 0 7 19 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>0 2 10 25 5</td>
<td>0 1 3 17 0</td>
<td>0 0 3 20 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>2 24 7 8 1</td>
<td>1 16 3 1 0</td>
<td>6 14 10 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>13 22 6 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 6 14 1 0</td>
<td>10 14 5 0 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>27 15 0 0 0</td>
<td>20 1 0 0 0</td>
<td>20 7 1 0 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>0 - 9</td>
<td>10 - 20</td>
<td>20 - Over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>3.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>4.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>4.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>4.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>3.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>4.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>4.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>3.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>3.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average mean

| 3.33 | 3.68 | 3.89 |
statement in each of the three groups. The average mean was then determined for each group.

Table XII shows the relationship between the unfavorable statements and education beyond the Bachelor's level. The mean was determined for each statement in each of the three categories. The average mean was then determined for each category.

Participation - Means

Respondents were asked to indicate the amount of their debate participation in relation to other debaters. A five point scale of much less, less, average, more, and much more was used. Tabulation of the raw scores may be found in Table XIII.

Since few respondents marked their questionnaires much less or much more, the much less and less categories were combined as were the more and much more categories. The combination of categories was used to determine the mean scores in Tables XIV and XV.

Table XIV shows the relationship between the favorable statements and amount of participation. The mean was determined for each statement in each category. The average mean for each category was then determined.

Table XV shows the relationship between the unfavorable statements and amount of participation. The mean was determined for each statement in each category. The average mean for each category was then determined.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>0 - 9</th>
<th>10 - 20</th>
<th>20 - Over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average Mean**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - Over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average mean: 3.75, 3.77, 3.87
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Much Less - Less</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>More - Much More</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>2.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average mean 2.21  2.02  2.00
Significance of Differences

The significance of the mean differences was determined by comparing the mean of each category with the total mean of the group. The following formula was used to determine the t scores: 14

\[ t = \frac{M_1 - M_2}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{\sum d_1^2 + \sum d_2^2}{n_1 + n_2 - 2}\right) \left(\frac{1}{n_1} + \frac{1}{n_2}\right)}} \]

Table XVI shows the significance of the means in each category for favorable items. First, a summary of average means was given as compared with the total mean; second, the mean difference was determined; and third, the t value was calculated. None of the category means was significant at either the five per cent or one per cent level.

Table XVII shows the significance of the means in each category for unfavorable items. First, a summary of the average means as compared with the total mean of the group was given. Second, the mean difference was determined. Third, the t value was calculated. None of the category means was significant at either the five per cent or one per cent level.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Mean difference</th>
<th>t value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education 0-9 months</td>
<td>3.87 vs. 3.83</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>0.416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education 10-20 months</td>
<td>3.87 vs. 3.68</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>1.495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Over 20 months</td>
<td>3.87 vs. 3.89</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>0.196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years graduated 1920-1932</td>
<td>3.87 vs. 3.88</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>0.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years graduated 1933-1945</td>
<td>3.87 vs. 3.86</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>0.099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years graduated 1946-1957</td>
<td>3.87 vs. 3.77</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>0.948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation Much less, less</td>
<td>3.87 vs. 3.75</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>1.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation Average</td>
<td>3.87 vs. 3.77</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>0.793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation More, much more</td>
<td>3.87 vs. 3.87</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TABLE XVII. SIGNIFICANCE OF MEANS ON UNFAVORABLE ITEMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Mean difference</th>
<th>t value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-9 months</td>
<td>2.02 vs 2.10</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>0.715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-20 months</td>
<td>2.02 vs 1.83</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>1.645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 20 months</td>
<td>2.02 vs 2.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>0.106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years graduated</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920-1932</td>
<td>2.02 vs 1.97</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>0.531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933-1945</td>
<td>2.02 vs 2.08</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>0.545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946-1957</td>
<td>2.02 vs 2.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>0.088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much less, less</td>
<td>2.02 vs 2.21</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>1.910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>2.02 vs 2.02</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More, much more</td>
<td>2.02 vs 2.00</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>0.175</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND INTERPRETATIONS

The purpose of this study was to determine attitudes concerning the values and limitations of debating. The universe was made up of graduates of South Dakota State College who had received membership in Pi Kappa Delta, national honorary speech fraternity.

This chapter will present (1) a summary of the conclusions, and (2) interpretations.

The reader should remember that the scale values used in this study were, 1 - strongly disagree, 2 - disagree, 3 - uncertain, 4 - agree, and 5 - strongly agree.

Summary of Conclusions for the Entire Sample

(1) The item showing the highest amount of agreement for favorable items, with a mean of 4.34, was number eighteen, "teaches one to analyze arguments."

(2) The item showing the least amount of agreement for favorable items, with a mean of 3.47, was number twenty-nine, "develops avid reading habits in current affairs."

(3) The average mean for items favorable toward debate was 3.87.

(4) The item showing the greatest amount of disagreement for unfavorable items, with a mean of 1.35, was number fifty-two, "has no educational value."

(5) The item showing the least amount of disagreement for unfavorable
items, with a mean of 2.79, was number twenty-four, "makes one argumentative."

(6) The average mean for items unfavorable toward debate was 2.02.

Summary of Conclusions for Year Graduated

Favorable Items:

(1) The item showing the highest amount of agreement from 1920-1932, with a mean of 4.45, was item number eighteen, "teaches one to analyze arguments."

(2) The item showing the least amount of agreement from 1920-1932, with a mean of 3.35, was number twenty-nine, "develops avid reading habits in current affairs."

(3) The average mean for favorable items from 1920-1932 was 3.88.

(4) The items showing the highest amount of agreement from 1933-1945, with a mean of 4.30, were number eighteen, "teaches one to analyze arguments," and number twenty-three, "develops the ability to extemporize and express thoughts clearly."

(5) The item showing the least amount of agreement from 1933-1945, with a mean of 3.43, was number twenty-nine, "develops avid reading habits in current affairs."

(6) The average mean for favorable items from 1933-1945 was 3.86.

(7) The item showing the highest amount of agreement from 1946-1957, with a mean of 4.25, was item number eighteen, "teaches one to analyze arguments."

(8) The item showing the least amount of agreement from 1946-1957, with
a mean of 2.80, was number seventeen, "fosters an intense interest in public affairs."

(9) The average mean for favorable items from 1946-1957 was 3.77.

Unfavorable Items

(10) The item showing the highest amount of disagreement from 1920-1933, with a mean of 1.48, was number fifty-two, "has no educational value."

(11) The item showing the least amount of disagreement from 1920-1933, with a mean of 2.52, was number twenty-four, "makes one argumentative."

(12) The average mean for unfavorable items from 1920-1933 was 1.97.

(13) The item showing the highest amount of disagreement from 1933-1945, with a mean of 1.22, was number fifty-two, "has no educational value."

(14) The item showing the least amount of disagreement from 1933-1945, with a mean of 2.56, was number fifty, "teaches one to suppress evidence."

(15) The average mean for unfavorable items from 1933-1945 was 2.08.

(16) The item showing the highest amount of disagreement from 1946-1957, with a mean of 1.33, was number fifty-two, "has no educational value."

(17) The item showing the least amount of disagreement from 1946-1957, with a mean of 2.69, was number twenty-four, "makes one argumentative."

(18) The average mean for unfavorable items from 1946-1957 was 2.03.
Summary of Conclusions for Education

Favorable Items

(1) The item showing the highest amount of agreement from zero to nine months, with a mean of 4.26, was number eighteen, "teaches one to analyze arguments."

(2) The item showing the least amount of agreement from zero to nine months, with a mean of 3.29, was number thirty-five, "promotes a habit of thorough research."

(3) The average mean for education from zero to nine months was 3.83.

(4) The item showing the highest amount of agreement from ten to twenty months, with a mean of 4.48, was number eighteen, "teaches one to analyze arguments."

(5) The item showing the least amount of agreement from ten to twenty months, with a mean of 2.67, was number forty-eight, "has occupational value."

(6) The average mean for education from ten to twenty months was 3.68.

(7) The item showing the highest amount of agreement for twenty months and over, with a mean of 4.35, was number nineteen, "teaches quick thinking."

(8) The item showing the least amount of agreement for twenty months and over, with a mean of 3.48, was number twenty-nine, "develops avid reading habits in current affairs."

(9) The average mean for education of twenty months and over was 3.89.
Unfavorable Items

(10) The item showing the highest amount of disagreement from zero to nine months, with a mean of 1.12, was number fifty-two, "has no educational value."

(11) The item showing the least amount of disagreement from zero to nine months, with a mean of 2.69, was number thirty-four, "makes one too aggressive in dealing with others."

(12) The average mean for education from zero to nine months was 2.10.

(13) The item showing the highest amount of disagreement for education from ten to twenty months, with a mean of 1.05, was number fifty-two, "has no educational value."

(14) The item showing the least amount of disagreement from ten to twenty months, with a mean of 2.62, was number twenty-four, "makes one argumentative."

(15) The average mean for education from ten to twenty months was 1.83.

(16) The item showing the highest amount of disagreement for twenty months and over, with a mean of 1.57, was number fifty-two, "has no educational value."

(17) The item showing the least amount of disagreement for twenty months and over, with a mean of 2.63, was number twenty-four, "makes one argumentative."

(18) The average mean for education for twenty months and over was 2.01.
Summary of Conclusions for Participation

Favorable Items

(1) The item showing the highest amount of agreement for participation in the much less and less category, with a mean of 4.13, was number eighteen, "teaches one to analyze arguments."

(2) The item showing the least amount of agreement for the much less and less categories, with a mean of 3.33, was number forty-eight, "has occupational value."

(3) The average mean for participation for the much less and less category was 3.75.

(4) The item showing the highest amount of agreement for participation in the average category, with a mean of 4.44, was number eighteen, "teaches one to analyze arguments."

(5) The items showing the least amount of agreement for participation in the average category, with a mean of 3.19, were number forty-one, "teaches one to recognize propaganda," and number forty-eight, "has no occupational value."

(6) The average mean for participation for the average category was 3.77.

(7) The items showing the highest amount of agreement for participation in the more and much more category, with a mean of 4.30, were number eighteen, "teaches one to analyze arguments," and number twenty-three, "develops the ability to extemporize and express thoughts clearly."

(8) The item showing the least amount of agreement for participation in the more and much more category, with a mean of 3.44, was number twenty-nine, "develops avid reading habits in current affairs."
(9) The average mean for participation in the *more* and *much more* category was 3.87.

**Unfavorable Items.**

(10) The item showing the highest amount of disagreement for the *much less* and *less* category, with a mean of 1.47, was number fifty-two, "has no educational value."

(11) The item showing the least amount of disagreement for the *much less* and *less* category, with a mean of 2.73, was number twenty-four, "makes one argumentative."

(12) The average mean for unfavorable items for the *much less* and *less* category was 2.21.

(13) The item showing the highest amount of disagreement for the *average* category, with a mean of 1.36, was number fifty-two, "has no educational value."

(14) The item showing the least amount of disagreement for the *average* category, with a mean of 2.50, was number twenty-four, "makes one argumentative."

(15) The average mean for unfavorable items for the *average* category was 2.02.

(16) The item showing the highest amount of disagreement for the *more* and *much more* category, with a mean of 1.33, was number fifty-two, "has no educational value."

(17) The item showing the least amount of disagreement for the *more* and *much more* category, with a mean of 2.74, was number forty-two, "is too
formal for effective research and reasoning."

(18) The average mean for unfavorable items for the more and much more category was 2.00.

Interpretations

The interpretations made as a result of this study are (1) college debaters, graduated from South Dakota State College between 1920 and 1957, who received membership in Pi Kappa Delta, consider debate training beneficial; and (2) since the respondents' opinions of debate are favorable, it would seem that their training in debate tended to be beneficial to them. These interpretations are based on the following conclusions:

1. In computing the raw totals for the total sample, no favorable item fell below the 3.0, uncertain mark; and no unfavorable item went above the 3.0, uncertain mark.

2. Respondents tended to agree that debate teaches one to analyze arguments, since this item had the highest favorable mean in eight of the nine areas of comparison for favorable items.

3. Respondents tended to agree that debate teaches quick thinking, since this item had the second highest mean in six of the nine areas of comparison for favorable items.

4. Respondents tended to agree that debate develops the ability to extemporize and express thoughts clearly, since this item had the third highest favorable mean in six of the nine areas of comparison for favorable items.

5. Respondents tended to be less willing to agree that debate develops
avid reading habits in current affairs, since this item had the lowest mean in four of the nine areas of comparison for favorable items.

6. Respondents tended to be less willing to agree that debate promotes a habit of thorough research, since this item had the second lowest mean in four of the nine areas of comparison for favorable items.

7. Respondents tended to be less willing to agree that debate teaches one to take criticism well, since this item had the third lowest mean in three of the nine areas of comparison for favorable items.

8. Respondents tended to be most willing to reject the statement that debate has no educational value, since this item had the lowest mean in all nine areas of comparison for unfavorable items.

9. Respondents tended to be willing to reject the statement that debate fosters intolerance, since this item had the second lowest mean in seven of the nine areas of comparison for unfavorable items.

10. Respondents tended to be willing to reject the statement that debate makes one unethical, since this item had the third lowest mean in three of the nine areas of comparison for unfavorable items.

11. Respondents tended to be less willing to reject the statement that debate makes one argumentative, since this item had the highest mean in six of the nine areas for comparison for unfavorable items.

12. Respondents tended to be less willing to reject the statement that debate makes one aggressive in dealing with others, since this item had the second highest mean in four of the nine areas for comparison for unfavorable items.

13. Respondents tended to be less willing to reject the statement that
debate stresses winning too much, since this item had the third highest mean in four of the nine areas for comparison for unfavorable items.

14. The more participating an individual did in debate the more favorable his attitude was toward debate. In Table XIV, the average mean for the much less and less category was 3.75. The mean progressed to 3.77 for the average category and to 3.87 for the more and much more category. The same trend may be observed in Table XV for unfavorable statements. The average mean for the much less and less category was 2.21. The mean dropped to 2.02 for the average category and to 2.00 for the more and much more category. While these differences are not statistically significant, the trend is consistent.

Thus, it appears that this group of debaters feel that debate taught them to analyze arguments, to think quickly, and to extemporize and express thoughts clearly. They reject the idea that debate has no educational value, that debate fosters intolerance, and that debate makes one unethical.

The results also suggest that we might question authors who take the position that debate has value in developing avid reading habits in current affairs, in promoting thorough research, and in learning to take criticism well. And we might give some consideration to the writers who suggest that debate training could result in making one argumentative, in making one aggressive, and in stressing winning too much.

Generally, the conclusion most warranted appears to be that the group used in this study were highly favorable to the program of extracurricular work in debate.
Suggestions for Further Study

The major suggestion for further study might be that a similar survey be done in other institutions so that comparison would be possible.

A second suggestion might be that a similar study be done in other areas of speech, such as discussion and drama.
LITERATURE CITED


APPENDICES
APPENDIX I

MATERIAL USED FOR PRELIMINARY QUESTIONNAIRE

A. Preliminary Questionnaire
B. Evaluators of the Questionnaire
C. Questionnaire suggestions and/or corrections
APPENDIX I – A

PRELIMINARY QUESTIONNAIRE

Name ___________________________________________ Occupation _____________________________

Address ___________________________________ City __________________ State _________________

Sex M ___ F ___ Age _______ Year graduated from SDSC ________________

College degree held from SDSC ____________________________________________________________

Degree or amount of education beyond the Bachelor's level ________________________________

How many years did you participate actively in debate? 1 ___ 2 ___ 3 ___ 4 ___

Was your participation in relationship to the other participants,

much less ____ less ____ average ____ more ____

much more ______

5

Do you wish to be sent a copy of the results of this study? Yes ___ No ___

The following statements are frequently made about debate. From your experiences in college debate, will you please express your attitude about the following statements using this attitude scale:

strongly disagree disagree uncertain agree strongly agree

1 ___ 2 ___ 3 ___ 4 ___ 5

FROM MY EXPERIENCES I BELIEVE DEBATE:

___1. Fostered an intense and continuing interest in public affairs.

___2. Teaches one to analyze arguments.

___3. Teaches quick thinking ("thinking on your feet").

___4. Makes one unethical.

___5. Makes one insincere.

___6. Teaches critical and evaluative listening.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Develops the ability to extemporize and express thoughts clearly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Makes one argumentative.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Teaches leadership.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Teaches one to be poised and self-confident.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Takes too much time on the part of the coach.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Takes too much time on the part of the student.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Develops avid reading habits in current affairs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Costs are too great for too few students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Teaches one to take criticism well.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Develops logical thinking.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Teaches one to detect emotional proof in others' arguments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Makes one aggressive in dealings with others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Promotes a habit of thorough research.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Stresses winning too much.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Increases frustrations and tensions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Fosters intolerance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Develops a respect for others' opinions on controversial issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Becomes an exercise in sophistry (subtle reasoning).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Teaches one to recognize propaganda.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Is too formal for effective research and reasoning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Gives one knowledge about authorities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Becomes an exercise in memorization rather than thinking.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Makes one strongly opinionated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
strongly disagree disagree uncertain agree strongly agree
  1    2    3    4    5

  30. Gives one knowledge about documentation.
  31. Makes one strongly impulsive.
  32. Has occupational value, (helps in getting and adjusting to a job).
  33. Fosters intellectual curiosity.
  34. Teaches one to suppress evidence.
  35. Effects scholastic standing adversely.
  36. Has no educational value.

Comments:
APPENDIX I - B

EVALUATORS OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Edmund G. Blinn
Associate Professor, Printing and Rural Journalism
South Dakota State College

Douglas Chittick
Professor, Rural Sociology
South Dakota State College

Alphus R. Christensen
Administrative Assistant
South Dakota State College

Clarence E. Denton
Assistant Professor, Speech
South Dakota State College

David B. Doner
Director of Admissions and Records
South Dakota State College

Maynard Fox
Professor, English
South Dakota State College

Harry E. Hulse
Associate Professor, Education
South Dakota State College

Oscar Olson
Dean, Graduate School
South Dakota State College

George H. Phillips
Professor and Head, Printing and Rural Journalism
South Dakota State College

David Priestley
Graduate Assistant, Rural Sociology
South Dakota State College
Marion L. Shane
Professor, English
South Dakota State College

Donald Sikkink
Associate Professor and Head, Speech
South Dakota State College

Stanley Sundet
Professor and Head, Education
South Dakota State College

Orlin E. Walder
Professor of Math, Director of Student Affairs
South Dakota State College

Carl L. Wilson
Associate Professor, Speech
South Dakota State College
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QUESTIONNAIRE SUGGESTIONS AND/OR CORRECTIONS

1. Use an example in the second part of the questionnaire for items 17-52.

2. Allow the respondent to remain anonymous. Ask for name and address only if a copy of the results is desired.

3. Use legal size paper (8½ x 14) instead of 8½ x 11.

4. Provide space for additional comments by the respondent.

5. Use "indifferent" for "uncertain" in the attitude scale.

6. In the directions to the second part ask the respondent to indicate his "agreement or disagreement" with each statement instead of his "attitude", as some may have an unfavorable reaction to the word "attitude."

7. Include a statement asking the respondent to answer all questions.

8. Include a question asking the respondent to indicate his win-loss record in college debate.

9. Include a question asking the respondent to estimate the number of debates participated in while in college.

10. Include a question concerning the participation in debate as related to other extra-curricular activities participated in.

11. The respondent's request for a copy of the results should be placed at the end of the questionnaire.

12. The cover letter accompanying the questionnaire should be kept short.

13. Limit the time for returning the questionnaire to ten days.

14. Limit the time for returning the questionnaire to three weeks.

15. Item number four, break it down into categories.

16. Item number eight, leave out college degree held from South Dakota State College, ask only for the year graduated.
17. **Item number ten**, ask for the degree or credit hours beyond the Bachelor's level.

18. **Item number ten**, provide blanks with specific areas of time.

19. **Item number eleven**, use "seasons" of debate rather than "years" of debate.

20. **Item number eleven**, use "none, freshmen, sophomore, junior, and senior" to designate which years the individual participated.

21. **Item number sixteen**, use a five-point scale for the respondent to indicate amount of participation.

22. **Items 17 through 52** might be organized into "purpose categories."

23. There was a question concerning duplication in the following items: 18 and 22, 19 and 23, 17 and 29, 16 and 33, 24 and 38, 24 and 45, and 20 and 50.

24. **Item number seventeen** previously read "intense and continuing"; it was suggested that "continuing" be omitted to avoid confusion.

25. **Item number thirty** previously read "costs are too great for too few students". Costs to whom needed to be clarified.

26. **Item number thirty-three** previously read "emotional proof" instead of "illogical proof"; there was confusion as to the rhetorical meaning of "emotional proof".

27. **Item number thirty-four**, add the word "too" in order to make it definitely negative.

28. **Item number forty**, "sophistry" was previously used instead of "trickery"; the meaning of sophistry was not clear to some.

29. **Item number forty-eight**, the question was not sufficiently explicit; "helps in securing and advancing in a job" was added.

30. A question on debate's developing leadership was excluded, since other items (19, 22, 23, 26, 29, 31, and 32) include elements of leadership.
APPENDIX II
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QUESTIONNAIRE

(Ignore the numbers in parenthesis ( ). They are for IBM tabulating purposes.)

(1-3)

(4) Occupation __________________ (5) Sex M__ F__ (6-7) Age_______

(8-9) Year graduated from SDSU ________

(10) How much work beyond the Bachelor's level have you done?

0-9 months____ 10-20 months____ more than 20 months____

(11-15) Which years did you participate actively in debate? (check)

none ___ freshman ___ sophomore ___ junior ___ senior ___

(16) How much did you participate in relation to the other debaters?

much less ___ less ___ average ___ more ___ much more ___

The following statements are frequently made about debate. From your experiences in college debate will you please indicate your agreement or disagreement with each statement using the scale below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRONGLY DISAGREE</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
<th>UNCERTAIN</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>STRONGLY AGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FROM MY EXPERIENCES IN DEBATE I BELIEVE DEBATE:

(Example:) ___ Causes one to lose sleep.

(17) ___ Fosters an intense interest in public affairs.

(18) ___ Teaches one to analyze arguments.

(19) ___ Teaches quick thinking ("thinking on your feet").

(20) ___ Makes one unethical.
STRENGTH DISAGREE  DISAGREE  UNCERTAIN  AGREE  STRONGLY AGREE

(21) ____ Makes one insincere.
(22) ____ Teaches critical and evaluative listening.
(23) ____ Develops the ability to extemporize and express thoughts clearly.
(24) ____ Makes one argumentive.
(25) ____ Fosters a continuing interest in public affairs.
(26) ____ Teaches one to be poised and self-confident.
(27) ____ Takes too much of the coach's time.
(28) ____ Takes too much of the student's time.
(29) ____ Develops avid reading habits in current affairs.
(30) ____ Costs to the college are too great for too few students.
(31) ____ Teaches one to take criticism well.
(32) ____ Develops logical thinking.
(33) ____ Teaches one to detect illogical proof in other's arguments.
(34) ____ Makes one too aggressive in dealing with others.
(35) ____ Promotes a habit of thorough research.
(36) ____ Stressess winning too much.
(37) ____ Increases frustrations and tensions.
(38) ____ Fosters intolerance.
(39) ____ Develops a respect for others' opinions on controversial issues.
(40) ____ Becomes an exercise in trickery.
(41) ____ Teaches one to recognize propaganda.
(42) ____ Is too formal for effective research and reasoning.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRONGLY DISAGREE</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
<th>UNCERTAIN</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>STRONGLY AGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(43)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(44)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(45)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(46)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(47)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(48)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(49)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(50)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(51)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(52)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(43) ______ Gives one knowledge in how to recognize authorities.
(44) ______ Becomes an exercise in memorization rather than thinking.
(45) ______ Makes one strongly opinionated.
(46) ______ Gives one knowledge about documentation.
(47) ______ Makes one strongly impulsive.
(48) ______ Has occupational value (helps in securing and advancing in a job).
(49) ______ Fosters intellectual curiosity.
(50) ______ Teaches one to suppress evidence.
(51) ______ Affects scholastic standing adversely.
(52) ______ Has no educational value.

Use this space for any additional comments you may have related to the limitations and/or merits of debate.

If you prefer to remain anonymous and do not wish a copy of the results, you should not sign your name or give your address.

Do you wish to receive a copy of the results? Yes ___ No ___

Name________________________________________ Address__________________________

City________________________ Zone No.______ State__________________________
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SOUTH DAKOTA STATE COLLEGE of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts
College Station - Brookings, South Dakota

Division of Science
and Applied Arts
Speech Department

29 June 1959

Dear Pi Kappa Delta Member:

You were once a member of Pi Kappa Delta at South Dakota State College and now hold permanent national membership. You can be of great assistance to the present South Dakota State chapter, and you can learn what your colleagues in this organization think about debate. All you need to do is fill out the inclosed questionnaire.

Allow me to introduce myself. I am a graduate student in speech at State College and a former Pi Kappa Delta member of Buena Vista College. For my thesis project I am conducting a survey of SDSU Pi Kappa Delta members to obtain information concerning opinions about debate. The statements on the questionnaire are based on an analysis of the written articles in the field of speech.

Your cooperation in making this survey as valid as possible would be most appreciated. Please remember that I want the opinion you now hold.

It should not take more than 10 or 15 minutes to complete the questionnaire, seal it in the stamped envelope provided, and drop it in the mail. Will you please return it by July 10, 1959?

The information received could be of great value to the students and coaches of debate. On the basis of this study it may be possible to determine where the present program could be reorganized for the good of everyone involved. The information may also be beneficial to other debate programs throughout the nation. Remember to indicate on the questionnaire if you would like a copy of the results.

Why not fill it out right now, before you forget or misplace it?

Thank you for your interest and cooperation.

Sincerely,

/s/ Carol Hamner Bowles

Carol Hamner Bowles
APPENDIX II - C

SOUTH DAKOTA STATE COLLEGE of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts
College Station - Brookings, South Dakota

Division of Science
and Applied Arts
Speech Department

July 13, 1959

Dear Pi Kappa Delta Member:

You were recently mailed a questionnaire concerning opinion about debate. Upon checking my records, I note your questionnaire has not yet been returned. Since the validity of the study is dependent upon the percentage of returns received, I am hoping you will complete and return the questionnaire to me within the next few days. Inclosed you will find a second copy of the questionnaire in the event you have lost or misplaced the first one.

If your questionnaire is now in the mail, please disregard this letter.

Your cooperation will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

/s/ Carol Hammer Bowles

Carol Hammer Bowles
Department of Speech
South Dakota State College
Brookings, South Dakota
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*Anderson, LaVerne
   Wagner, South Dakota

Anderson, Sigurd
   18326 Occidental Avenue
   Seattle 66, Washington

*Ausman, Leslie V.
   113 South Madison
   Pierre, South Dakota

Austin, Geraldine (Mrs. Kenneth O'Brien)
   5400 Beale Drive
   Denver 22, Colorado

Belk, Ethel
   3606 Oxford Milville Road
   Oxford, Ohio

*Bernhart, Finn
   585 Cricket Lane
   Radnor, Pennsylvania

*Bice, Ruth
   2006 Parkside
   Bremerton, Washington

*Bigger, George C.
   627 North 1st Street
   Dekalb, Illinois

*Bottom, J. Carroll
   611 Rose Street
   West Lafayette, Indiana

*Breed, Virginia
   1675 E Visalia Avenue
   Berkeley 7, California

Broussard, Dale W.
   429 E. Grand Avenue
   El Segundo, California

*Brown, Elizabeth (Mrs. Ralph C. Peppers)
   S. 97th Street
   Belleville, Illinois
Brown, Dr. George  
707 Bowling Green  
Moorestown, New Jersey

Brown, Winifred (Mrs. Cory Christensen)  
409 North Harth  
Madison, South Dakota

Brudos, Jo Ann (Mrs. Borge H. Hansen)  
910 4th Street  
Brookings, South Dakota

Burke, Kenneth  
North Western Drive  
Storm Lake, Iowa

Burge, Margery (Mrs. P. Lawrence Miller)  
905 Prospect Avenue  
Box 135  
Spring Lake Heights, New Jersey

Burris, Robert  
1015 University Bay Drive  
Madison 5, Wisconsin

Carlson, Gordon  
1041 S. E. Cass Avenue  
Rosenburg, Oregon

Case, Jack  
1209 15th Street  
Bismarck, North Dakota

Cave, Richard  
% Mrs. Jennie Garlough  
Route 5  
Springfield, Ohio

Chapman, Richard L.  
2869 South Buchanan B-1  
Arlington 6, Virginia

Chase, Marcus  
Arlington, South Dakota

Cram, Dr. W. Arthur  
2716 N. E. Skidmore Street  
Portland, Oregon
Cranston, Joe E.
2416 Bay Street
Bakersfield, California

*Dearborn, Delwyn
1306½ Fifth Street
Brookings, South Dakota

*Denholm, Frank
Federal Bureau of Investigation
Salt Lake, Utah

*Doner, David R.
628 13th Avenue
Brookings, South Dakota

Dooley, J. W.
1220 W. 20th Street
Apartment 6
Sioux Falls, South Dakota

*Dyste, Lt. Col. Howard
1802 Madison Street
Bellevue, Nebraska

*Erickson, Kenneth
1518 South Lincoln
Aberdeen, South Dakota

Fischbach, John E.
U. W. Naval Hospital
Bremerton, Washington

Fischbach, Thomas
Department of Rural Sociology
University of Wisconsin
Madison 6, Wisconsin

*Fisher, Hardin
428 Geneva Avenue
Hillside, Illinois

*Foulke, Anna (Mrs. Anna Hubbell)
603 11th Avenue
Brookings, South Dakota

*Fosheim, Kay (Mrs. Joseph Caffey)
% Oscar Fosheim
Howard, South Dakota
*Frothinger, Helen (Mrs. Hollins Emmerich)  
Hq. U. S. Army Aggressor Center  
Ft. Riley, Kansas

Fryer, Elsie (Mrs. C. J. Williams)  
1710 Makiki Street  
Apartment 405  
Honolulu, Hawaii

*Giraud, Roslyn (Mrs. Alfred Eken)  
280 Egle Street  
Geneva, Ohio

Goplin, Clara (Mrs. Emory L. Bruns)  
1851 Charneleton  
Eugene, Oregon

*Grotta, Bertha (Mrs. Bertha Willett)  
504 Princeton Drive S. E.  
Albuquerque, New Mexico

*Hanson, John N.  
% PCS Inc.  
831 14th Street  
Denver, Colorado

Hanson, Howard  
513 South Madison Street  
Pierre, South Dakota

*Holl, Harold H.  
18162 Wellington Avenue  
Tustin, California

*Harpstead, Milo Irving  
Department of Soils  
University of Minnesota  
St. Paul, Minnesota

*Hauff, Howard F.  
824 East 4th Street  
Blue Earth, Minnesota

Heaton, Corrinne (Mrs. Robert Staples)  
1040 North 65th Street  
Lincoln 5, Nebraska

*Hermann, Wilford  
Route 2  
Miller, South Dakota
Higdon, Col. Archie  
Department of Mechanics  
USAF Academy  
Denver 8, Colorado

Hinrich, Mavis (Mrs. Paul M. Uthe, Jr.)  
Hatton, North Dakota

Howe, Fern  
Prehn, South Dakota

Hullinger, Clifford  
10628 South Lawdale Avenue  
Chicago, Illinois

Humphrey, Emma L. (Mrs. Earl Rogness)  
1452 S. W. Knauss Road  
Oswego, Oregon

Jensen, Lillian (Mrs. John McNeely)  
317 Brookside Drive  
Bryan, Texas

Johnson, Canute  
RFD 3  
Brookings, South Dakota

Johnson, Irwin  
16871 Elm Lane Drive  
Tinley Park, Illinois

Johnston, Leonard E.  
127 Wyandotte Road  
Hoyt Lakes, Minnesota

Jones, S. W.  
1227 2nd Street  
Brookings, South Dakota

Kooper, Lyle  
Sioux Falls College  
Sioux Falls, South Dakota

Kopperud, Harmon  
Lake Preston, South Dakota

Kranz, Albert B.  
2027 Douglas Avenue  
Racine, Wisconsin
Kroghman, Marian
414 6th Street
Brookings, South Dakota

Kuhlman, Milton
5607 Sherman Avenue
Edina, Minnesota

Ladd, Leonard L.
Clear Lake, South Dakota

Lanz, Lillie (Mrs. Alton Jarmuth)
1022 A 2nd Avenue North
Great Falls, Montana

Latimer, Margaret (Mrs. Norton Edwards)
Cummings Road
Akron, New York

Laxson, Dr. Gerald O.
Veterans Administration Hospital
Sheridan, Wyoming

Lowe, William S.
A. P. Green Fire Brick Company
Mexico, Missouri

Martens, Harvey A.
2918 South Buchanan Street
Apartment A-1
Arlington 6, Virginia

McNeeley, John G.
317 Brookside Drive
Bryan, Texas

Miles, Jerome
892 Monticello Drive
Falls Church, Virginia

Miller, Diana
Hot Springs, South Dakota

Moen, Robert L.
Sisseton, South Dakota

Moorman, Robert P.
% Ames Plantation
Grand Junction, Tennessee
Mortenson, Elmer  
155 Harold Avenue  
San Jose, California

Mortenson, Marie (Mrs. Marie Misty)  
1414 North 2nd Street  
Phoenix, Arizona

*Myers, Dr. Max  
Spencerville Road  
Spencerville, Maryland

*Nord, Alfred  
490 Hillside Avenue  
Rochester 10, New York

Nord, Robert D.  
15115 Flagstaff Road  
Brookfield, Wisconsin

Oines, Mildred (Mrs. John Moore)  
% Otto Oines  
Volga, South Dakota

*Olson, Edward O.  
609 West 4th  
Weslaco, Texas

*Opdahl, Milo S.  
1312 5th Street  
Brookings, South Dakota

*Owre, Harvy M.  
1255 Livermore Boulevard  
Livermore, California

*Orton, A. Bruce  
Plainview, Minnesota

*Page, Elizabeth (Mrs. John Bain)  
4518 S. W. Sixteenth  
Des Moines, Iowa

*Paulson, Joseph  
1432 7th Street  
Brookings, South Dakota

*Pearson, David F.  
1815 3rd Street  
Brookings, South Dakota
Perry, Murvin H.
525 South Johnson
Iowa City, Iowa

Platt, George M.
Hermosa, South Dakota

Porter, Jean M. (Mrs. R. K. Krohn)
4703-B Bradford Drive
Dallas, Texas

Raebel, Roy W.
18 West Drive
Decatur 46, Illinois

Redman, Robert
214 East 19th Street
Apartment 302
Minneapolis, Minnesota

Reiner, Harry
Hillview, South Dakota

Ritterbusch, Flen
500 East 7th Street
Mitchell, South Dakota

Sanders, Robert
Garretson, South Dakota

Salmon, Reo Arlene
405 St. Joe Street
Rapid City, South Dakota

Sauber, Bernard
P. O. Box 603
Dumas, Texas

Schaphorst, William K.
Box 197
Brookings, South Dakota

Schladweiler, Clarence
Madison, South Dakota

Schultz, Dr. Theodore W.
5620 Kimbark
Chicago, Illinois
Serie, Teresa A. (Mrs. Fred Zimmerman)
630 South 18th Street
Arlington, Virginia

Severson, Wayne J.
653 East Garver
Philadelphia 20, Pennsylvania

 Sharp, Josephine
 Box 14
 Aurora, Minnesota

Symond, Arthur
% Harlowe Resort
Mikana, Wisconsin

Sladek, Lyle
1033 East Second Avenue
Mitchell, South Dakota

Sladek, Virginia (Mrs. Don A. Jensen)
Route 1, Box 120
Beresford, South Dakota

Slocum, Walter L.
1910 Monroe
Pullman, Washington

Smith, Harold
104 Ormond Parkway
Ormond Beach, Florida

Smith, Ray H.
RFD 6
Frederick, Maryland

Smith, Robert
2810 Eisenhower Drive
South Bend, Indiana

Smith, Roy J.
2125 Pelham Avenue
Los Angeles 25, California

Smits, Deda Rae (Mrs. William H. Gamble)
627 Medary
Brookings, South Dakota

Solberg, Elizabeth A. (Mrs. J. B. Johnson)
Route 1
Touchet, Washington
Solberg, Harry L.
630 Rose Street West
Lafayette, Indiana

Spiers, Mildred (Mrs. Gerald Hedrick)
2522 Amherst Avenue
Kalamazoo, Michigan

Stamp, Donna Marie (Mrs. Alvin G. Auchstetter)
320 4th Avenue
Madison, Minnesota

Struve, Ronald L.
Associated Press Bureau
Box 192
Pierre, South Dakota

Sundal, Inda (Mrs. Glenn Avery)
256 6th Street S. E.
Huron, South Dakota

Stucke, Raymond E.
Gettysburg, South Dakota

Swancutt, Patricia (Mrs. Kenneth Knock)
1910 West 33rd Street
Sioux Falls, South Dakota

Thomas, Clark
Springfield, South Dakota

Thorstenson, Verne
Box 202
Selby, South Dakota

Thune, Edgar
Route 3
Brookings, South Dakota

Tidball, Nial E.
926 South Kline Street
Aberdeen, South Dakota

Tjostem, Lt. Col. Marvin L.
Pt. George G.
Meads, Maryland

Townsend, Margaret (Mrs. Elmer Eklo)
302 South 9th Avenue
West Bend, Wisconsin
*Tupper, Gilbert  
10715 Avonbury  
Whittier, California

*Unruh, Jeannette (Mrs. Raymond Horn)  
1617 1st Street  
Brookings, South Dakota

*Verthein, Kenneth  
4012 17th Avenue South  
Minneapolis, Minnesota

*Vessey, Robert  
765 South 3rd  
Sioux Falls, South Dakota

Vold, Dr. George  
95 Redford Street S. E.  
Minneapolis, Minnesota

*Volin, Dr. Verlynne V.  
1742 South Cliff Avenue  
Sioux Falls, South Dakota

Voss, Fordyce A.  
3618 South Taylor Street  
Arlington, Virginia

*Wagner, Eileen M. (Mrs. Robert P. Hoorman, Jr.)  
% Ames Plantation  
Grand Junction, Tennessee

Wallis, G. Carroll  
Eton Lodge  
Garth Road  
Scarsdale, New York

Walters, Olive (Mrs. H. H. Hawlick)  
21 South Alford Boulevard  
Evansville 14, Indiana

*Wedmore, Melvin D.  
4319 South 35th Street  
Arlington 6, Virginia

Wells, Darrell G.  
Box 622  
State College, Mississippi
Whitfield, Winifred (Mrs. Stanley P. Frauke)
2517 Walnut Avenue
Manhattan Beach, California

Wilkins, Patricia (Mrs. Cecil Halliday)
Danube, Minnesota

Williams, Donald
5135 North 15th
Arlington, Virginia

Woodruff, Ellen Jane (Mrs. Morris Rhian)
Camp Detrick
Pilot Plant Division
Fredrick, Maryland

*Those respondents who returned the questionnaire.