form of leadership in our work and personal lives. Transformational leadership emphasizes a moral dimension by stressing the needs, values, and morals of the members of our debate community, and the relationship between the leader and the members. If transformational leadership is practiced in CEDA, members must be motivated to rise above their own self-interests for the good of their students and the CEDA organization.

As president of CEDA I learned that trying to transform CEDA is a very difficult and time consuming task. I encourage future leaders to continue trying as there is much community support. We have a long way to go but I am optimistic that achievement of our vision and goals will produce a better organization and form of debate unlike anything we have seen before. Our students are certainly worth it!

WORKS CITED

Bass, B.M. (1985). *Leadership and Performance Beyond Expectations.* New York: Free Press.

Bass, B.M. (1994). *Improving Organizational Effectiveness through Transformational Leadership.* Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.

Burns, J.M. (1978). *Leadership.* New York: Harper & Rowe

Larson, G. (March 29, 1996). *Executive Secretary's Report-CEDA.* Report presented at the CEDA national business meeting, Long Beach, California.

Northouse, P.G., (1997). *Leadership: Theory and Practice* . Thousand Oaks, California: Sage pp.130-158

Simerly, Greg (March 28, 1997). *Executive Secretary's Report-CEDA.* Report presented at the CEDA national business meeting, Wichita, Kansas.

Tichy, N.M., & DeVanna, M.A. (1986). *The Transformational Leader* New York: John Wiley.

Tichy, N.M. & DeVanna, M.A. (1990). *The Transformational Leader* New York: John Wiley.

CONTEMPORARY ARGUMENTATION AND DEBATE 18
(1997) 89-107

BOOK REVIEWS

T. C. Winebrenner, Editor

Public Argument. By Robert O. Weiss. Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America, 1995. ISBN 0-8191-9900-1. 189 pages. $23.50 paper.

By professing to focus on "reasoned communication which is directed toward real audiences under conditions of controversy to gain their assent on matters of general concern" (5), Weiss serves notice that *Public Argument* is not a typical competitive debate manual. Although many may object to the judgments implied through the use of terms like "real audiences" or "genuine communication" to distinguish public debate, Weiss is attempting to reach a very specific readership: those who view debate as a civic exercise whose worth is a product of its capacity to value, elevate and influence public opinion. The most likely audience for this book would consist of co-curricular programs, argumentation/ communication instructors, and civic groups that emphasize public deliberation. The text is not geared toward contemporary competitive tournament activities. Although Weiss notes that "in tournament competition it is possible, using some care, to find meets explicitly subscribing to an audience centered philosophy" (vii), his claim that decisions made as a product of public debate are less concerned with "which team did the better job of debating" (10) than with an audience's opinion with regard to the proposition as a result of the exchange implies that he sees such opportunities as the exception rather than the rule.

Spanning thirteen chapters, *Public Argument* falls into two main sections. The first five chapters establish a rationale for public argument, discussing the audiences, formats, and interaction styles and topics that typify public forum debate. The remaining chapters provide a more technical treatment of how one prepares to participate in public debating. This section takes the reader through a discussion of types of propositions, audience analysis, gathering and evaluating evidence, reasoning, communication, and decision making and concludes with advice on the building and maintenance of a public debate program.

It is customary for authors to open with homage to the place of argument in a democracy, but such concerns are often marginalized in chapters that focus heavily on strategies and tactics absent consideration of their philosophical underpinning. Not so for Weiss, whose initial treatment of "The Rationale for Public Debate" infuses the entire text. According to

Weiss, the justification for public debate rests with its ability to mold public opinion through rational argument. It is an activity that respects popular judgment and serves the democratic system by cultivating informed assent on issues that make a tangible social difference. These ideas are constantly reinforced, even when the technical components of the debate process such as topic selection, research, reasoning, case construction, delivery and format are at issue. In short, technical and strategic concerns are cast in terms of how they enable participants to best serve the audiences addressed. The centrality of this audience friendly philosophy is established early in the text:

> Therefore, almost anything you would want to know about public argument is answered by referring to the audience members who are taking part in it. If you want to know what constitutes evidence in public argument, you simply ask what it is that audience members know or are willing to accept. It isn't evidence until somebody accepts it. If you are puzzled about how the wording of a proposition should be interpreted, you find out by asking what it means to the people who are sitting before you. Even if you ask what kind of delivery you should use in speaking, you remind yourself that the best use of voice and action is whatever makes arguments comprehensible and effective for the collection of "judges" who constitute your audience (2).

The confidence Weiss places in the audience's verdict is cogently argued and results in a text that attends more to the "why's" than the "how-to's" of public debate. One gets the impression that technical details are kept intentionally minimal in favor of a more experimental mood that would suggest that adjustments be made as a result of the public's verdict on our forays into the civic arena. Additionally, Weiss acknowledges that variations on time, place and circumstance make an offering of rules hazardous, at best. When offering advice on matters of technique, Weiss is often brief. Certainly, the details are present, though they are hardly belabored. This is less a criticism than a warning to instructors who would use this text; there are a number of sections that may not satisfy a student's need for detail at first glance. The caution implied here is not that the text lacks detail, but rather an observation on the book's organization. The "basics" are introduced and then fleshed out in subsequent discussions where Weiss considers how such techniques will likely manifest themselves in public performance. In short, the thematic unity of the text means that the reader is not offered a series of "stand alone" chapters. This is rendered less daunting by an informal style and judicious use of humor that results in a text that is highly accessible, non-pretentious, and a deceptively quick read.

The early chapters of the text focus on the occasions for and types of public debate. Chapter 2, "The Public in Public Argument," provides a relatively thorough account of the

locales for debate (ranging from civic groups to "bull sessions") and should prove useful in acquainting the reader with the varied opportunities available. Chapter 3 explores formats for public debates by listing a variety of options followed by Weiss's suggestion that the structure of the event must "depend in each case on the immediate circumstances" (31). Though these circumstances are left vague at this juncture (to be fleshed out in subsequent chapters), the chapter holds up well and is relatively comprehensive.

The discussion of public debate formats gives Weiss an opportunity to refocus on his notion of audience members as participants by providing suggestions for how immediate verbal feedback might be encouraged and incorporated into the overall performance. This theme is reinforced repeatedly in subsequent chapters. The various roles available to the audience are the subject of Chapter 4, which suggests means by which the functions of passive observer or score keeper might be transcended. "Topics in the Public Realm" is the subject of Chapter 5, which provides inventional advice to guide in the selection of topics that audiences "really care about" (59) while at the same time allowing for responsible efforts at "the creation of a public agenda" (59). Weiss's comments about propositions for debate, which concludes the first section, seems a bit sketchy when he advises with respect to wording debate resolutions: "Do the best you can and get on with the debate" (67). Such advice constitutes a gentle jab at those of us who would seek strategic advantage by agonizing over fine points of grammar or exploring the technically permissible boundaries of a proposition at the expense of issues a public audience would deem central. It is an appropriate conclusion to the text's first section in that it reminds us that public debate is designed to "facilitate rational public deliberation and decision making" (71) rather than a forum for "a simple exhibition of skill or cleverness" (6).

The text's second section turns its attention to the principle speakers in public debate by offering advice on how one prepares for participation, opening with three interconnected chapters devoted to the location and testing of arguments.

The "Analysis of Propositions and Audiences" may be one of the text's weaker chapters if read in isolation. The overriding theme is that one should seek out central issues making "what people are saying" concerning the topic under investigation the starting point for analysis (75). This is doubtless sound advice and consistent with the audience centered nature of the text, but an all too brief discussion of stock issue formulas and audience analysis techniques fails to provide a thorough treatment of how such schemes might be systematically applied to aid in the search for central issues. The problem is perhaps organizational rather than conceptual since the treatment of audience analysis in Chapter 7 admirably fills in the gaps. Weiss examines how one locates areas of agreement that might serve as the starting place for argument in "Premises in Public Debate." He advises speakers to consider what an audience knows, their values, their world view, their characteristic patterns of thought, and those whom

they trust. Lest this be mistakenly read as a mandate to pander to an audience, Weiss discusses the research process as going beyond what listeners "already know and believe" to satisfy an ethical obligation to make debate "a learning experience" (93).

Testing premises is the subject of the subsequent chapter, which focuses on refutation. The most important contribution of this chapter is the discussion of values and common sense which, according to Weiss, "provide as much a base for public argument as do documented sources and specialized facts" (115-116). Weiss treats values and common sense with respect and provides productive lines of argument for the reader.

The discussion of "Continuity and Clash" features Weiss at his best. One senses that Weiss is more enthusiastic in discussing the actual debate process than he is about enumerating all of the steps leading up to it (although he does a good job with the latter). Cautioning that debate is a "disciplined endeavor" requiring a "method to the madness" (129), Weiss seems enamored of the drama inherent in the unexpected twists and turns a public debate will take. To make such an event "dull and uninteresting takes real effort," according to Weiss (129). Offering a means of maintaining a degree of productive focus by "reinforcing what is significant, weeding out a lot of inanities," Weiss offers a variety of techniques that allow the advocates to highlight central issues (130). His section on metaphor, extending, repetition, incorporating the arguments of others and relating contributions offered back to central themes is concise and clear. His discussion of techniques of clash is as equally compelling as his attention to the oft neglected art of incorporating audience questions into the overall presentation. Underlying the chapter is Weiss's constant reminder that debate is for the audience and they expect and deserve meaningful clash over central issues.

Chapter 11 covers "Facilitating Communication." While the information contained in this section would not be considered novel, its inclusion is vital in that it allows a discussion of one of the most common misconceptions about public debate -- specifically, that it encourages style over substance. The fact that the majority of the text focuses on issues of invention ought to indicate to the reader that Weiss does not see that to be the case. On the issue of communication, Weiss discusses the classical cannons of arrangement (organization), style (verbal communication), and delivery (non-verbal communication) as being central. Readers might well incorporate standard communication texts to supplement this section lest they find his advising speakers to monitor feedback to evaluate the appropriateness of their manner of presentation, and to let audience will dictate communication style, a bit too non-committal. The basic advice provided by Weiss is that the nature of public debate demands consideration of the audience, and the speaker is obligated to make their "arguments accessible to almost everyone" in an effort to secure "the kind of full participation that is desirable in public debate" (148).

Overall, *Public Argument* makes a valuable contribution to our understanding of the assumptions that underlie public debate activities. Though those favoring a more "traditional" competitive tournament regimen may not agree with such assumptions, Weiss makes a compelling and consistent case. The text should be invaluable for instructors wishing to incorporate public performance into their classrooms, community service projects, or as a supplement to competitive tournament travel.

The most significant value of *Public Argument* may well lie with the contribution it makes to the ongoing debate about debate. Managing to avoid a tone that is harsh or accusatory, Weiss is able to enumerate the assumptions that render public debate so dramatically different from typical competitive tournament forums. Readers comfortable with commonplaces that proclaim "debate is for debaters" or who hold that "non-intervention" should characterize the stance of decision makers will find Weiss's assumptions challenging. Weiss envisions an activity in which debate is for audiences and the opinions of listeners inevitably influence public dialogue. Hopefully, in light of the growing diversity in debate activities, thoughtful analysis like that contained in *Public Argument* will help this community move beyond petty squabbles over who is "best," to a richer understanding of the value of the many manifestations of collegiate debate activity.

Larry Underberg
University of South Dakota

Candidates in Conflict: Persuasive Attack and Defense in the 1992 Presidential Debates. By William L. Benoit and William T. Wells. Tuscaloosa, Alabama: University of Alabama Press, 1996. 261 pages. $24.95 paper.

In addition to the quadrennial debate about presidential debates occurring between representatives from the participating campaign teams, there is an ongoing debate among scholars as to whether or not presidential debates deserve to be called debates. In *Candidates in Conflict: Persuasive Attack and Defense in the 1992 Presidential Debates,* Benoit and Wells provide an analysis that should help put an end to at least one of the debates over the debates. While claims that presidential debates are counterfeit often rest on application of academic debate standards, Benoit and Wells suggest that political debates are actually hybrids which should be evaluated on the basis of the candidates' use of persuasive attack and defense strategies. To that end, the book uses a content analysis of the 1992 presidential debates

involving George Bush, Bill Clinton, and Ross Perot to document the degree to which attack and defense strategies are employed in political debates.

The primary audience for a book that analyzes the 1992 presidential debates will certainly be scholars and students of political debates and campaigns. However, the book should be of interest to scholars who study argumentation and persuasion strategies, especially those related to image building. Because there is little theory regarding attack strategies in particular, a typology for studying attack arguments has potentially broad application. The book serves as an excellent example of the merging of more traditional rhetorical/critical methods with social science techniques, and could be used in a research methods course to illustrate recent trends in political communication research methods. Finally, anyone who works with political candidates in preparing them for debates will find the book informative and instructive.

Slightly more than half of the book is devoted to Part One, which provides critical analysis of the 1992 debates. Part Two is comprised of transcripts of the three presidential debates, and two appendixes that explain and illustrate the methodology.

The opening chapter reviews past research on political debates to establish their importance to campaigns in terms of viewership and impact. The authors draw important distinctions between the nature of political debates and debates in other contexts, especially academic debating. Additionally, they reject the notion that issue and image arguments are separable. Benoit and Wells acknowledge that other scholars have identified attack and defense strategies in political debates. However, they argue that unlike the current study, past works have not comparably analyzed the strategies. The chapter concludes with a list of research questions and a summary of the discursive context of the debates based on polling data, editorial commentary, and the role of Ross Perot.

Chapter 2 reviews research on persuasive attack and defense in order to develop a methodology which provides unique insight into the argumentative nature of political debates. This chapter is rich largely because it builds on Benoit's programmatic study of discourse that concerns face, image, and reputation. The authors demonstrate that while communication scholars have looked extensively at *apologia,* little attention has been given to the attacks that require such a response. The chapter draws largely from literature outside the context of political argument; however, political attack research by Michael Pfau and Henry C. Kenski (*Attack Politics*) and by Kathleen Jamieson (*Dirty Politics*) is included. Benoit and Wells conclude by constructing a system of *topoi* for attack and defense strategies, which they clearly outline in tables and explain in the text.

Chapter 3 details the results of an analysis of persuasive attack, beginning with reporting comparative frequencies for each candidate by debate. Each candidate's use of attack

strategies is examined both through reference to the data produced by the content analysis, and through illustrations drawn from transcripts of the debates. Comparisons among the three candidates are highlighted, and the chapter concludes with a discussion of the issues addressed in the attacks. Chapter 4 follows this pattern in analyzing the defense strategies employed by the candidates. Both chapters include tables summarizing the frequency counts.

The final chapter in Part One, "Evaluation," makes critical judgments about each candidate's use of both strategies, and attempts to relate debate performance to electoral outcomes. The authors support their claims about the relative effectiveness of each candidate's strategic use of attack and defense through references to polls, focus group studies, and analyses by pundits and scholars.

Part Two of the book includes the transcripts for the three presidential debates. Using the *New York Times* transcripts as their starting point, the authors provide corrected versions based on comparisons with videotapes of the debates. These transcripts add to the value of the book in that many of the previously available transcripts, which were distributed immediately following the debates, contain errors. It is also useful to have access to the transcripts for reference.

The two appendixes outlining methodology are thorough and easily understood. The first explains the methodology, and the second contains a sample coded transcript. Including the source for the computer program "The Ethnograph," which was used by the authors, is helpful to anyone wanting to replicate the study.

By the author's own admission, this book began as a journal article and grew. Thus, it is structured and reads as an extended research report. Since the authors had the luxury of a book format, some areas would have benefited from expansion. For example, the authors give short shrift to previous content analysis studies that examine the form of arguments in presidential debates. While previous studies cited by the authors did not use the attack and defense framework, or as elaborate a typology as the authors develop, they do present proof that presidential debates have clash value and that candidates attack one another and defend against attack. By not giving more detailed analysis of the findings of previous studies and comparing them to their own findings, Benoit and Wells succeed in bolstering the claim that they are the first to analyze attack and defense strategies, but they fail to derive insight and comparisons that would add to an overall understanding of presidential debates.

A second area which would benefit from additional analysis is found in Chapter 5, where the authors discuss the effects of format on the degree to which candidates used attack and defense strategies. The 1992 debates incorporated three different formats: a standard panelist debate; a town hall debate; and a debate combining a single moderator with a panel. The authors made frequent references to the influence of the town hall participants on the

reduced number of attack arguments in the Richmond debate. Those who viewed this debate will remember that the citizen questioners made it clear they did not want mudslinging or character attacks. While that fact explains the differentials when comparing Richmond with St. Louis or East Lansing, there is another basis for comparison that was not explored: the content of the questions asked by panelists. The methodology section notes that questions were not analyzed. The authors refer to questions from the panelists only insofar as to compare the quality of their questions to those of the citizens. However, a candidate's use of attack and defense strategies may be affected by the way a panelist frames a question. Since the panelist format directed questions to particular candidates rather than to all candidates, the candidates may not have been given occasion to engage in attack or defense at the same levels. Furthermore, the last debate incorporated a single moderator for half of the debate, Jim Lehrer, who asked the candidates to compare themselves and their policies to one another, directly inviting attacks. Thus, the influence of professional questioners on strategic choices should not be overlooked when comparing the frequencies with which the candidates employed attack and defense strategies across the debates.

As with any good study, questions are raised as well as answered. This book raises several which warrant additional study. In that sense, the book is valuable in pointing a direction for researching the 1996 debates and beyond. Additionally, it suggests the need to revisit past debates and apply the methodology to them as well. Taken together, patterns can be better established which could provide some of the answers to long-standing disagreements over the effect of format, quality of questions, incumbency/challenger issues, and third party presence on forms and levels of clash in debates. Also, as the authors suggest, findings regarding attack and defense strategies in political debates should be compared to use of the strategies in other forms of campaign communication.

Overall, Benoit and Wells have moved research on political debates ahead several steps. In one study, they were able to incorporate findings from the growing body of research on political debates, persuasive defense, and *apologia* that incorporates multiple methods to ask a new set of questions and to develop a new framework for analysis. By providing a solid theoretical grounding for their study, they have moved beyond mere description to analysis and theory building. This book should inspire and encourage scholars interested in political debates, argumentation, and persuasion to ask new questions and to employ new methods in their research.

Diana B. Carlin
University of Kansas

The Art and Practice of Argumentation and Debate. By Bill Hill and Richard W. Leeman. Mountainview, California: Mayfield, 1997. ISBN 1-55934-448-2. 360 pages. $33.95 paper.

Argumentation and debate texts perennially make choices among tensions. How much argumentation theory versus how much competitive debate practice? Focus upon what debate format? Provide what balance between competitive and pedagogical concerns? Approach at what level of complexity? Include how much academic apparatus? While this text is unquestionably more about intercollegiate debate than general argumentation theory, Hill and Leeman make a substantive effort to provide authentic balance among all these tensions. The authenticity stems from deeply exploring the educational, communicative, and developmental aspects of the debate activity without condemning or underplaying the core competitive features. Most notably, the text successfully avoids preaching or appeals to authority, and works to ground all the discussions of differing perspectives functionally and empathetically. When approaches conflict situationally, concrete examples are provided and the detailed choices are left to instructors and students.

In fifteen thoughtful chapters, instructors seeking to prepare students to debate, whether on the intercollegiate circuit or for a public forum, are likely to find what they need in this text. Chapters on ethics and communication are substantive and will please those oriented toward public debate, while chapters on case development, issue analysis, propositions, refutation, responsibilities, etc. are up-to-date and fully cognizant of the realities of contemporary team debate competition. The chapters and portions of chapters devoted to non-policy debate have been written so as to retain theoretical value even if events in the team debate world may be moving so as to render them less of a competition concern in the near future.

No doubt in deference to students encountering the material for the first time, the authors have a tendency to hide their unique lights under a basket. Most chapters begin with familiar discussions reflective of typical chapters in nearly every other argumentation and debate text one might pick from the shelves. However, within a few pages Hill and Leeman evolve perspectives that, in fact, tie many otherwise apparently conventional and disconnected ideas into an organically holistic thesis about the nature of argumentative choices.

The introductory chapter builds upon a naturalistic rationale for argument, addressing the motivation to argue, but then shows how the construction and testing of argument works synergistically with the interpersonal dimension. Debate is described as an educational and communicative act, but also as prepared argument and a team activity. The chapter on ethics is a notable example of the authors' tendency to cocoon their strength within the apparently conventional. Using a common usage dictionary to define ethics, then moving rather quickly

to evidence issues and the AFA Code of Ethics, the chapter makes an insipid initial impression upon an experienced reader. However, within five pages the authors are engaged in a discussion of the functions of ethical perspectives, employing democratic and dialogic approaches to a *telos* for establishing one's own ethical judgments. By the end of the chapter, one is impressed with the connection between this discussion and the material in the preceding chapter, and can see rather clearly how subsequent chapters are likely to emphasize choice-making as not merely the outcome of debate, but an integral part of its process as well.

Chapter 3, "The Components of Argument," introduces probably the most extensive adaptation of the Toulmin model in an argumentation textbook since Ehninger and Brockriede pioneered its use in their 1963 text *Decision By Debate*. Although the model is a nearly universal feature in subsequent texts (mostly in very abbreviated form), Hill and Leeman give it central importance in their work. They are especially strong in using it as an analytical tool rather than just an interesting theoretical formulation. They emphasize its strengths in creating a systematic model for reclaiming the dialectical/interrogative techniques by which probabilities in argument can be evaluated. They go beyond Toulmin in extending the model to show how counter-arguments fit into the process at every level. This becomes especially valuable as they demonstrate the ability of such systematic application to clarify the choices by which auditors will resolve the refutation they hear. Those who have always enjoyed putting the Toulmin model to real use in an argumentation class will be enormously pleased with the authors' efforts, even if inclined to quibble with how some of the terms are applied.

The chapters on evidence and reasoning are helpful and practically oriented. The down to earth discussion of the difficulties of "cutting" evidence is just one example of a tone of voice which continually reflects a coaching rather than a lecture stance. One could occasionally hope for stronger definitions of basic concepts such as "evidence" and "inference," but the material unfolds without major holes. Chapters 6 and 7 cover refutation and types of propositions. These chapters are sound and benefit from selected bibliographies that give historical perspective as well as noting articles comprising the most recent scholarship. Chapter 8 deals with fundamental argumentative constructs such as presumption and burden of proof, while Chapter 9 is especially noteworthy in its treatment of "Issues and Analytical Models." Both chapters continue to draw upon the Toulmin model to help correlate concepts. In particular, the treatment of presumption as a psychological as well as a stipulated component of argument is enormously helpful. Chapter 9 also excels by treating stock issues from a number of perspectives as analytical models ranging from the classical stasis system to the narrative paradigm. The authors achieve their objective of integrating diverse approaches in a very practical way, always employing examples that are easy to apply.

Chapters 10 and 11 cover basic questions of format, note-taking, and speaker responsibilities and lay out the rudimentary basics of affirmative case construction. The material on flowing uses careful diagrams that will be of real assistance to novice debaters. In the treatment of basic affirmative case construction, the discussion of the use of introductions, previews, under views, and affirmative rationale creates a communicative rather than prescriptive-mechanistic tone to this preliminary material.

Chapter 12 focuses specifically and more technically on non-policy affirmatives while Chapter 13 unfolds more advanced material for policy affirmatives. Chapter 14 incorporates both policy and non-policy approaches in discussing negative argument. In treating the non-policy issues, the extensive development of argument fields in relation to the generation of criteria is especially innovative and interesting. Of course this is a further elaboration of Toulmin's ideas, but it is especially well-developed. One almost feels regret that non-policy debate may be on the way to oblivion because this particular treatment gives new sophistication to the often murky area of value criteria. Nonetheless, even if intercollegiate competition bypasses this class of propositions, both general argumentation and argumentation theory students will benefit from the discussion of argument fields.

In the concluding chapter, the question of effective communication is treated with sophistication. Audience analysis and adaptation are specifically addressed as well as specialized listening skills within the debate context. Credibility is treated from a research perspective and cross-examination is treated extensively.

A somewhat unique feature at the end of the book is an extensive glossary. In fact it is rather more than a glossary since it comprises not only specialized terms, but also a large number of conceptual references. As such it is even more useful than a mere list of definitions since it often cross-references concepts and provides short explanations or applications. The glossary would make an excellent student study guide as some entries are treated to five or six lines of explanation

As a textbook, *The Art and Practice of Argumentation and Debate* has limitations. The beginnings of chapters could do much more to highlight and outline key ideas. The authors are to be commended far avoiding compendious lists, but a judicious bullet here and there would prove helpful to students trying to survey in advance what they are supposed to get out of a chapter. However, the book is valuable. Hopefully adoptions will justify a second edition which could bring with it a little more pedagogical apparatus at the beginnings of the chapters to help draw attention to unique features which now emerge only after a very willful dissection of the material. Also, the chapter conclusions are often too general to promote a sense of the distinctiveness of the authors' approach.

Overall, for those seeking a balanced and sophisticated approach in an introductory course that gets students ready to debate, this is a strong pick.

Stephen C. Koch
Capital University

Argumentation: Inquiry and Advocacy 3rd edition. By George W. Ziegelmueller and Jack Kay. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1997. ISBN 0-13-088774-9. N.p. hardcover.

Authors who write or update argumentation texts face at least two extremely difficult tasks. First, they must provide a product that does not merely duplicate that which can be found elsewhere, while avoiding difference for the sake of difference. Second, they must decide whether their focus will be narrowed to a particular audience, or sufficiently broad to reach diverse groups. The third edition of *Argumentation: Inquiry and Advocacy*, by George W. Ziegelmueller and Jack Kay, approaches both tasks with vigor. While the authors fall short in some areas, the overall result seems destined to become one of the better textbooks available to the college argument instructor/student.

This text is divided into four components. The initial chapters lay the foundation for argumentation theory. Ziegelmueller and Kay define argumentation as including both *inquiry* and *advocacy*. Inquiry is the process of "discovering appropriate beliefs and actions" (5), while advocacy "involves using language strategies to justify our beliefs and actions to others" (6). Chapter 1 explicates the rationale for reasoned justification as an alternative to violent confrontation or emotional pleading, and notes the probabilistic nature of truth-seeking through argument. Chapter 2 presents a mostly standard analysis of types of propositions used as argumentative claims, and fundamental concepts such as burden of proof, presumption, and the *prima facie* case.

The second section of the text deals with critical inquiry. Chapters survey the nature and structure of arguments, ways of discovering and testing data in support of a claim, inductive and deductive reasoning, and fallacies. In an attempt to appeal to the growing critical thinking market, the third edition includes a chapter on "Fallacies," which the authors proclaim "equips students with the tools to succeed in critical thinking classes" (cover). While a study of fallacious reasoning is presumptively important to critical thinking, no evidence is provided that this chapter alone, or the text in general, is truly designed for such a course.

Part three of the text discusses the advocacy dimension of argumentation, with chapters dealing with techniques for analyzing non-policy and policy propositions, methods for

organizing and briefing arguments, new material on narrative form and communicating arguments, and a "richer" discussion of argument fields.

In the final section of the text, Ziegelmueller and Kay address concerns specific to academic debate in various formats, including chapters on refutation techniques, cross-examination, affirmative and negative strategies, and a new glossary of academic debate terms.

There are several strong points in this edition. Exercises are instructive and interesting. Both new and experienced argumentation teachers should benefit from these devices, which can be used as homework/activity assignments, in-class discussion motivators, or even exam questions. Chapter 4, "Discovering Data," examines in unusual depth the premises of our perceptual and value assumptions. It successfully differentiates between the general initial research phase, and the different needs of argument-specific research, and contains a thorough analysis of electronic database research. The section on how to read material in order to find evidence most effectively is valuable to beginning argument students and contest debaters.

Chapters 6, 7, and 8 provide an insightful and clear analysis of inductive and deductive reasoning and argument fallacies. Chapter 14, which includes advice on communicating arguments effectively, should be required reading for every intercollegiate debater. The theoretical justifications and practical advice for improving communication skills could do much to improve what many critics find frustrating about contemporary intercollegiate debate. A stand-alone chapter on narrative gives a concise, yet excellent, coverage of Fisher, although narrative's "true believers" may balk at the implication that narrative is a means of supporting arguments rather than a unique argumentation theory.

The academic debate formats chapter in the final section of the text recognizes the growth of NFA Lincoln-Douglas debate and the increasing popularity of parliamentary style debating. While a complete analysis of each format is beyond the reasonable scope of the text, students of both formats should benefit from the earlier chapters discussing the premises for supporting material, and the place of narrative in argumentation theory.

Ziegelmueller and Kay fall victim to some traps inherent in coping with the dilemmas discussed in the opening paragraph of this review. In trying to break new ground, the authors seem to overreach at times. In Chapter 3, they describe a model of argument which includes "data, the reasoning process, and the conclusion" (37). A graphic on the same page depicts this triad in virtually the same fashion as every text analyzing the Toulmin Model. The authors claim their model is different in that reasoning does not include the psychological processes inherent in Toulmin's "warrant," and because their model does not include a secondary triad of backing, rebuttals and qualifier. This seems an unremarkable difference. What reasoning processes are *not* "psychological" in nature? How does the absence of the secondary triad improve the model? The authors would be on stronger ground had they credited Toulmin, and

then explained how they would adjust the model. There are other instances in which the authors are guilty of overreaching. Chapter 10, in discussing policy analysis, substitutes the terms "ill," "blame," "cure," and "cost-benefit analysis" for the more familiar "significance," "inherency," "plan," and "counterplan."

In Chapter 1, the authors seem to give short shrift to non-violent confrontation as an embodiment of argumentation. Chapter 2, and the concluding section on academic debate, both reveal a strong propositional bias to a view of argumentation that may frustrate narrative philosophers who find their theory mainly shoveled into a late chapter. The dynamic nature of systems theory is virtually ignored in the discussion of presumption, and the authors never successfully meet their early promise to explain why they treat propositions of fact and value as single form. By placing the refutation chapter in the section on academic debate, one might infer that refutation is unimportant to argumentation outside classroom.

The most glaring outright error in the text is the continued use of dated material regarding the Cross Examination Debate Association format of team debate. The authors insist on a description of CEDA as "value" debate, even though their list of recent CEDA topics contains an obvious policy resolution, and they ignore the trend of several years duration in which CEDA topics addressed policy or pseudo-policy issues even though the resolutions were not expressly framed in policy terms. The authors can be forgiven for being caught by publication deadlines before the NDT decided to adopt CEDA's policy resolution for the 1996-1997 season. They should, however, have corrected the outdated 8-3-4 time limits they describe in their discussion of the CEDA format.

The problems with the text are not as significant as its strengths. While similar weaknesses can be found in most argumentation texts, the strengths of *Argumentation: Inquiry and Advocacy* set it above its competitors. Still, there is room for an improved fourth edition: Integrating the narrative paradigm throughout the text, including refutation earlier in the scheme, updating erroneous information about CEDA debate, and eliminating artificial distinctions would make the text even stronger.

While it has little to offer as a general critical thinking textbook, this latest effort by Ziegelmueller and Kay remains an excellent introductory argumentation text, a valuable resource for those preparing to teach debate, and an effective instructional aid for aspiring college debaters.

Terry L. West
Southern Utah University

Argumentation and Critical Decision Making 4th edition. By Richard D. Rieke and Malcolm O. Sillars. New York: Addison Wesley Longman, 1997. ISBN 0-673-98079-0. 318 pages. $37.50 hardcover.

As a starting point, let me indicate that I have long been a fan of the Rieke and Sillars book, *Augmentation and Critical Decision Making*. When the text first appeared in 1975, it was significantly different from many of the competing books available for those of us teaching courses in argumentation and debate. Over the years, the book has retained most of the features that initially distinguished it -- application of several principles drawn from the works of Stephen Toulmin, Chaim Perelman and others that move the study of argument beyond its traditional origins; a healthy respect for traditional conceptions of argument along with a commitment to incorporate recent scholarship in argument; and a focus on argumentation as practiced in a series of specialized arenas such as law, politics, and business. Any book that finds its way to a fourth edition, especially in a somewhat small market like argumentation studies, is a durable, reliable work.

One risk confronting any text progressing through multiple editions, however, is that the book will change in ways that may not satisfy everyone. I approach my next point with more than a little trepidation; my credentials as a reviewer pale in comparison to those of the authors. I am, however, part of the audience for whom this book is written. The Rieke and Sillars text has always emphasized the importance of keeping the audience at the center of the study of argument, so it should come as no surprise that this review focuses on the fourth edition as it relates to the audiences likely to use it. I believe the authors are imagining their audience differently for the fourth edition than they did when the book was first produced, and my opinion is that the fourth edition is less effective than it might otherwise be because the text does not meet the needs of some of its potential audiences as well as it might.

The first two editions of *Argumentation and the Decision Making Process* put the audience of students in argumentation and debate activities at the center of the text. The preface of edition one, for example, states that "we think that a study in argumentation and decision making should reflect the best modern scholarship and should provide a content-oriented body of knowledge that can be taught with forensics in such a way that both subjects are mutually complementary" (vi). In the second edition, the authors reasserted the primacy of the "debate" audience even as they broached the subject of expanding the book's market: "While designed for Argumentation and debate courses in Speech Communication, the book may also be useful for courses in departments of English, Rhetoric, Business, Education, and Philosophy, and in special programs such as those for pre-law students" (vi). In imagining an audience of debate

students, either those in forensics or in argumentation and debate courses, the authors clearly centered the attention of the text on a group of potential users.

The third edition is an interesting transitional point, for the authors make no claim about the students likely to be primary users of the book. Instead, the attention is on the "profound changes in the way that scholars view argumentation" (xix). Then comes the current edition, in which the authors contend that the book "is equally applicable to written or oral discourse, and it provides for multiple perspectives such as composition, critical thinking, debate, or informal logic" (xvii). In attempting to broaden the market reach of the book, the audience of "debate students" moves from a place of primary interest to a one-among-many users status. That change in focus has some profound changes on the way the material is handled in the fourth edition.

On the surface, the third and fourth editions appear to be little different. Each has fifteen chapters, they come in the same order and have the same titles. Within those chapters are several changes in the way topics are developed which reveal the book's drift from its earlier purpose. In the preface to the second edition, the authors lamented the tendency for argumentation books to be either a discussion of theory or an explanation of how to argue, maintaining that *Argumentation and the Decision Making Process* presented a balanced treatment of both concerns. In the new edition, the balance has swung in favor of the theoretical at the expense of the practical. In short, the new material will appeal more to those interested in learning to describe argument than to an audience interested in learning how to argue more proficiently.

A case in point is the expanded treatment of narrative evidence in argument. An excerpt from a speech by Virginia Governor George Allen is included to show how he "uses examples of three families that he believes are typical of decision makers to personalize his argument" (125). The authors do not comment on Allen's use of these examples -- how does one tell if these examples are effective ones or not? Later, they restate earlier advice about the need for stories to "ring true for decision makers . . . [and to] have characters, action, motives, and outcomes that make sense to them" (126). But how does the person constructing an argument learn how to determine when these tests are met? Unlike traditional tests of examples (representativeness, sufficiency, relevance, etc.), which ask questions about the data, the test of "stories" as evidence asks questions about likely audience reception without offering advocates any meaningful way to gather information about audience reaction to the stories aside from hunches or some past experience that one might have with a particular audience.

Likewise, the new edition claims to place greater emphasis on interpersonal argument. One place where this change is most obvious is in Chapter 15, "The Language of Argumentation." The fourth edition definitely shifts the focus of this chapter from the public

sphere to the personal sphere. Gone is the section on "The Characteristics of Good Language Use." In its place, is "Language and the Communication of Argument," which focuses on the social nature of language and its dependence on interpretation. The section on "General Principles of Language Use" (including advice about transitions, signposts, and figures of speech) has been replaced by a discussion of "Language and Power Relationships" (focusing on unnecessary intensifiers, inappropriate qualifiers, and indirect requests). The new topics on language are certainly important concepts, but why are they central to a book about argumentation? One might find these ideas discussed in many other textbooks, and Rieke and Sillars offer no new insights nor uniquely apply these ideas to the argumentation context. What is revealing in the choice to include these new items is that they suggest a drift away from the balanced theoretical/practical approach toward a book that is more of a description about argument and argument theories.

I do not wish to be read as contending that the entire book abandons the task of enabling students to become better practitioners of argument. Several chapters maintain quite nicely the balance of theory and practice. One is Chapter 12 on refutation. Here the authors offer several pages of advice on how to think of and communicate refutations to opposing positions. Thankfully, this chapter omits a somewhat confusing digression which appeared in the third edition as one of "postures" for refutation; the discussion of "critical decision making" seemed out of place with other material in that section, and the decision to eliminate it is a good one. Of course, the fourth edition follows the third in failing to discuss standard refutation postures one finds in other argumentation texts (such as defending the status quo or offering a counter proposal).

The chapter on refutation (unlike many others) does not make enough use of examples to illustrate the advice offered. A "basic format for communicating refutation" is presented as a list without accompanying examples illustrating advocates using this approach when responding to an opponent. In other places, as in the discussion of testing credibility, the examples are too brief to illustrate fully how the refutation was implemented. Still, the chapter on refutation remains one of the better chapters in terms of practical guidance for making and evaluating arguments.

While the chapters on refutation represent particular strengths of this book, the same cannot be said for those on analysis and case construction. This weakness is critical to a book wishing to compete with rival works available for those teaching argument outside of speech communication departments. As the Chair of a Department of English, Linguistics, and Speech, I have become familiar with argumentation books on the composition market. Fundamental concepts associated with argument analysis (for example, burden of proof, presumption, the stock issues, guidelines for case construction) often get little mention in the argumentation texts

circulating among English departments. Either the concepts are not mentioned at all, or they receive minimal attention.

If this book wishes to compete against composition texts with an "argumentative" focus, it needs to offer material those texts do not. A thorough discussion of a variety of analytical systems, including stock issues, systems analysis, and stasis analysis can differentiate the argumentation texts written by those in communication studies from those written by authors in other fields. The same can be said for the discussion of case construction. The Rieke and Sillars text privileges a general discussion of finding issues and reduces the treatment of conventional analytical systems (like stock issues and methods for analyzing fact and value claims) to a mere five pages. The book also offers a less complete treatment of case building than do many competing argumentation texts written by persons with a background in speech communication and/or debate. Argumentation texts in the composition market give only brief attention to describing the patterns available for arranging the arguments in the body of a piece of argumentative discourse. The four-page discussion of specific case formats in this edition looks too much like the brief treatments in composition "argument" texts. I prefer the more extensive chapters on case construction available in several competing texts produced by others with a background in speech communication studies.

The fourth edition of *Argumentation and the Decision Making Process* undoubtedly will be a useful book for many courses. To their credit, Rieke and Sillars have updated many of the examples in the text and have revised the headings in some chapters to make the development of topics more coherent. (The former stand alone section on individual cognition has been incorporated into a more general discussion of argumentation and reasonability, for instance.) The book follows the third edition's decision to intermingle the chapters on specific spheres of argument (law, politics, business, etc.) rather than introducing them as a series of chapters at the end of the book. The separate-chapters-at-the-end approach of the first two editions worked better for my classes; others doubtlessly experienced the reverse.

If you are looking for a book that references many conclusions about argument behavior, this text would be a good choice. But if your audience is interested in skill development, you will have to decide whether this edition offers enough to help students understand how to fashion better arguments. My impression is that the fourth edition of Rieke and Sillars is a solid book, but I personally prefer the second edition with its balance of the practical and theoretical objectives that were at the foundation of their project when it began over twenty years ago.

John Morello
Mary Washington College

ADDITIONAL WORKS CITED

Rieke, Richard D. and Malcolm O. Sillars. *Argumentation and the Decision Making Process*. 3rd ed. New York: Harper Collins, 1993.

_____. *Argumentation and the Decision Making Process*. 2nd ed. Glenview, Illinois: Scott Foresman and Company, 1984.

_____. *Argumentation and the Decision Making Process*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1975.

CALL FOR PAPERS

Editorial Policy

Contemporary Argumentation and Debate: The Journal of the Cross Examination Debate Association is a refereed journal dedicated to publishing quality scholarship related to the theory and practice of academic debate, diversity issues, forensic tournament administration, public argumentation and debate, and other areas of interest to association members.

Of particular interest to the editor are articles relating to the relationship between academic debate and the broader disciplines of rhetoric, philosophy, and communication.

Submission Guidelines

Manuscripts should be prepared in accordance with the most recent edition of the *MLA Handbook for Writers of Research Papers.* The journal employs a blind review system. Manuscripts should be accompanied by a detachable cover page identifying the author(s), institutional affiliation(s), and e-mail address(es), but must not contain internal references which identify the author(s) or institution(s). If accepted for publication, the author(s) will be expected to submit the manuscript on disk. Manuscripts may not be returned. All correspondence related to the manuscript, including notification that the manuscript has been received, will be directed to the first listed author.

Four copies of the manuscript should be sent to:

T. C. Winebrenner
Editor, Contemporary Argumentation and Debate
Speech Communication Department
Cal Poly
San Luis Obispo, CA 93407