Works Cited

American Forensic Association. *AFA Newsletter*. River Falls, WI: American Forensic Association, 21 (June 1999).

Church, Russ. "Six vs. Eight." Online posting. 6 Nov. 1997. eDebate. <http://list.uvm.edu/archives/edebate.html>.

Engstrom, Carl. "Re: Sparky's Testimonial for 6." Online posting. 5 Nov. 1997. eDebate. <http://list.uvm.edu/archives/edebate.html>.

Freeley, Austin J., and David L. Steinberg. *Argumentation and Debate: Critical Thinking and Reasoned Decision Making* 10th Edition. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thompson Learning, 2000.

Gow, John E. "Tournament Debating: A Time for Changes." *Journal of the American Forensic Association* 4 (1967): 107-111.

Hernandez, Jason Peter. "8 versus 6." Online posting. 9 Nov. 1997. eDebate. <http://list.uvm.edu/archives/edebate.html>.

Kemp, Robert L., and Ted Marr. "The More the Merrier: A Rationale for the 8-round Tournament." *Journal of the American Forensic Association* 10 (1973): 11-15.

Klopf, Donald W. "Practices in Intercollegiate Speech Tournaments." *Journal of the American Forensic Association* 1 (1964): 48-52.

Mancuso, Steve. "6 rounds – AT: Newnam." Online posting. 6 Nov. 1997. eDebate. <http://list.uvm.edu/archives/edebate.html>.

Mills, Glen E. "A Symposium on Debate and Discussion: I. Audiences and Tournaments: Two Forms of Over Emphasis." *Speech Teacher* 9 (1960): 95-98.

Newnam, William E. "Re: 6, Elitism and Conservatism." Online discussion. EDebate. <http://list.uvm.edu/archives/edebate.html>.

Petelle, John L., and Donald O. Olson. "The Effect of Time Variation on Team Quality Ratings." *Journal of the American Forensic Association* 6 (1969): 21-23.

Petelle, John L. "A Comparison of Team Quality Ratings against Strong versus Weak Opposition.". *Journal of the American Forensic Association* 4 (1967): 104-106.

Smith, Ross. "Six Round Tournaments." Online posting. 5 Nov. 1997. eDebate. <http://list.uvm.edu/archives/edebate.html>.

Warner, Ede. "Re: Input Requested on UK tournament." Online posting. 9 July 1997. eDebate. <http://list.uvm.edu/archives/edebate.html>.

Zompetti, Joe. "Re: 8 vs. 6." Online posting. 6 Nov. 1997. eDebate. <http://list.uvm.edu/archives/edebate.html>.

CONTEMPORARY ARGUMENTATION AND DEBATE
21 (2000): 33-52

A Preliminary Study of the Relationships between Social Support, Self-Esteem, and Perceptions of Sexual Harassment in Intercollegiate Debate

Mark J. Jones and Glenda Treadaway

Perceptions of sexual harassment have received considerable research attention in intercollegiate debate. Szwapa, for example, surveyed female debaters and female coaches at an NDT tournament and found that the majority of her respondents reported that they perceived they had experienced some form of gender harassment (43). In a replication and extension of Szwapa's study, Stepp, Simerly, and Logue added male coaches and male debaters as respondents and queried the CEDA community (36). Their findings were consistent with Szwapa's results. In both studies, subjects perceived high levels of gender harassment, seductive behavior and sexual imposition in intercollegiate debate. While these studies highlight the clear perception that sexual harassment exists in the debate community, none were specifically designed to examine the effect that perceptions of sexual harassment have on self-esteem. These studies were not also constructed to investigate the relationship between social support and reports of sexual harassment. To fill this research gap, we explore the relationships among sexual harassment, self-esteem, and staff support. The ultimate goal of this line of research is to identify the behaviors that decrease the perception that sexual harassment exists in intercollegiate debate.

Background

Greenstreet et al. report that perceptions of sexual harassment in forensics result in feelings of lost control and loss of self. "Women in the field report being confronted with sexual harassment, sexism, employment discrimination, a lack of collegial support (or even collegial awareness that these events constitute a problem), and gender-based aggression from other females – all of which are behaviors which exclude them and which label them as 'different'" (17). They continue, "Harassment makes the victim feel isolated and

Mark J. Jones (M.A. California State University, Sacramento) is a doctoral candidate in the School of Interpersonal Communication at Ohio University. Glenda Treadaway (Ph.D. Ohio University) is an Associate Professor of Communication at Appalachian State University.

vulnerable. In one report, the victim also felt her students' success to be at risk. The combination of feeling personally excluded from the comfort and security males appear to share, and, at the same time, exposing those charged with nurturing to predatory behavior, is not an attractive prospect" (17-18). Stepp, Simerly and Logue conclude similarly: "Sexual harassment can affect not only whether students obtain their goals in debate, but their overall well being" (39). Thus, victims not only feel a sense of loss of self, but a sense of abandonment or lack of support from within the community. "As if the prospect of harassment alone were not enough to deter women from participating in the activity, those who would normally be expected to provide a support system – teammates, coaches, and colleagues – may disregard such incidents, thus denying the significance of both the behavior and the victim" (Greenstreet et al. 18).

Martinez and Dukes found that institutionalized racism and sexism decrease self-esteem. Their study, however, employed no direct measures of racism and sexism, spurring them to offer the following suggestions for future research: "Because education is a critical institution, which greatly influences the self-esteem of students, it is important that its effects on minorities and women be determined more directly by practices that enhance rather than attenuate their self-esteem" (334). We must find the ways and means by which to enhance debaters' self-concepts, a goal that is widely viewed as advantageous. "Enhancement of self-concept is widely valued as a desirable goal and has been posited as an intervening process that may lead to changes in other outcomes" (Marsh, Barnes & Richards 195) and thus, enrichment of self-concept should be a foundational goal of intercollegiate debate. One way we might enhance self-concepts is through social support.

Hobfoll defines social support as "those social interactions or relationships that provide individuals with actual assistance or that embed individuals within a social system, believed to provide love, caring, or a sense of attachment to a valued social group or dyad" (121). Pugliesi and Shook state:

> The importance of social support for health and well being has been aptly demonstrated by social and medical researchers. Social support exerts effects on emotional well-being and health in two major ways. As an intervening variable, social support can modify the impact of stressors and other exogenous factors on health and well-being. Social support also exerts direct effects on health and well being. (215)

They further note that "Numerous investigations suggest that social support enhances various aspects of subjective well-being and decreases levels of depression and psychological distress" (217). In a meta-analytic review, Johnson and Johnson reported that social support can increase physical and psychological health and self-esteem, and that social support can also increase our ability to cope with stressful situations (169). In stark contrast, sexual harassment decreases psychological well-being and has negative consequences on self-concepts. Thus, the Greenstreet et al. findings are not surprising. Social support should enhance self-esteem.

In an insightful article that investigated the prevalence of patriarchal structures within academic debate, Wilkins and Hobbs identify lack of support as one of the major obstacles that women encounter in intercollegiate debate.

> Mary learned long ago that there wasn't anyone that she could look to for help. A lot of male debaters were able to look to one another or their coaches for support but she had never felt like part of this network. Most of the successful debaters and the majority of the coaches on the circuit were men and Mary longed for a female mentor that she could depend on for advice and comfort. Her coach was a wonderful instructor, but she could never confide in him or turn to him for support. (58)

Research also suggests that social support is pivotal for women because they tend toward collectivist schemas such that interpersonal acceptance, their relationships with others, and a sense of connection are critical facets in their psychological health. Josephs, Tafarodi, and Markus explain the individualist/collectivist hypothesis best:

> Women are more likely than men to have what is called a collectivist, ensembled, or connected schema for the self. In such a self-schema, relations with other people, especially valued and important others, are crucial elements and thus others are represented as part of self, or included within the self. In contrast, men are relatively more likely to develop what is called an individualist, independent, or autonomous schema for the self. In this type of self-schema, others are represented not as part of the self, but rather as distinct from it. (391)

If the collectivist/individualist hypothesis is correct, women should favor connecting activities – activities where they can feel intimate with others, where communication is nurturing and supportive, and where they feel as though they are valued members of the group, the collective. And, when women's collectivist needs are filled, their self-esteem

should be enhanced. To construct an independent sense of self we would expect men to embrace activities that allow them to display their individual talents, to attempt to glean the spotlight and make a name for themselves. Men should require far less support than women. The collectivist standpoint directs us to some of the positive, supportive behaviors that women relish in their interpersonal relationships. Women should prosper in environments where their collectivist needs are satisfied.

One caveat is important. While we draw on the individualistic vs. collectivist hypothesis, we do not mean to suggest that women are endowed with genetically based, immutable characteristics and essentialized features. Griffin notes the harms of such a theoretical posture: "The tyranny of the essential still exists, [and] essentialism has found its way into the theories of this discipline. . . . [I]t can be used to silence, pigeonhole, and oppress women" (37). Our goal is to revitalize women's voices in the manner suggested by others (see Bisecker 140; Donawerth 38; Dow 106; Flores 142-144) and to engage in a constructive discussion by working from a general theory of differences (see Bjork and Trapp 34). We do not presume that all women are always collectivists; nor do we suggest that all men are individualistic. Any one person will probably share individualistic and collectivist traits in varying degrees. Most importantly, we certainly do not believe that these characteristics are immutable. In the most general sense, we maintain that the individualistic vs. collectivist hypothesis describes some qualities we might expect to see more in women than in men. Even then, the differences are unlikely to be significant and will vary based on context (Kolb & Putnam 234).

To situate social support and the need for interdependence into a more provocative theoretical framework, we draw on social interdependence theory as advanced by Johnson and Johnson. Social interdependence "exists when individuals share common goals and each individual's outcomes are affected by the action of others" (169). Johnson and Johnson identify three states of interdependence. A state of positive interdependence occurs when group members realize that they share a common fate, are striving for mutual benefits, have a shared identity, and have long-term time commitments. In intercollegiate debate, positive interdependence occurs when debaters, coaches, and administrators work cooperatively to achieve a mutual goal. Along the way, they identify with each other and are committed to the group. A state of negative interdependence occurs when group members perceive that a benefit for one is a cost for another, when members strive for different benefits, when members are in it for the short term, and when members have a

short-term time perspective. A state of no interdependence occurs when group members rely on themselves, rather than on others in the group, to reach their goals and to maintain their identity.

Applied to the debate context, the relationships among debaters, coaches, and administrators are classic examples of interdependence. Coaches depend on debaters to debate or there is no debate team. Coaches also depend on debaters to help them maintain a healthy and robust program. Debaters depend on coaches to take them to tournaments, assign appropriate partners, feed them, make travel arrangements, and provide a host of other services. Debaters also depend on their coaches to provide them with academic guidance, write letters of recommendation, and help them network for graduate school and/or jobs. Finally, debaters rely on their teammates and on other debaters on the circuit in which they travel. Debaters rely on their teammates to share evidence, strategies, and social support, and they depend on their opponents for competition and socializing. The critical point is that for intercollegiate debaters to maintain positive interdependent relationships, some level of social support is imperative (Johnson & Johnson 169).

Closely related to interdependence is the notion of social exchange. Social exchange theory predicts that relationships will be continued if the rewards of relational maintenance outweigh the costs (Roloff 14). Applying social exchange theory to our analysis, we predict that sexual harassment will be viewed as a relational cost, discouraging continued membership in the group, and lowering individuals' self-esteem. Conversely, we predict that the exchange of social support will be viewed as a relational reward and should enhance individuals' self-esteem and encourage them to stay in the relationship. Since sexual harassment robs its victims of their sense of self, decreasing self-esteem, social support should enhance students' sense of self and self-esteem. The more students report harassment, the lower we would expect their self-esteem to be. Where there is sexual harassment, we would expect support to be minimal, because social support seems to be the antithesis of sexual harassment, and where there is support reports of sexual harassment should be slight. To date no research on sexual harassment in intercollegiate debate has empirically confirmed or denied the relationship among student reports of sexual harassment, social support for students, and their self-esteem. As a consequence, we tread on new terrain and offer a pilot study that should have heuristic value. Specifically, we hypothesize that:

H1: Women will report significantly more experiences with sexual harassment than men.

H2: Reports of experiences with sexual harassment will be negatively correlated with social support by debaters and staff.

H3: Self-esteem will be negatively correlated with reports of experiences with sexual harassment.

H4: Self-esteem will be positively correlated with self-esteem social support by debaters and staff.

Methodology

Participants and Procedures. With the permission of the tournament director at a tournament in Northern California, a survey was distributed at the beginning of the fourth debate round. The judges received four surveys and a note asking them to distribute one to each debater. The respondents were told that their participation was voluntary and their responses would remain anonymous, only aggregate scores would be listed. Surveys were returned from forty-three of the eighty-eight possible respondents for a response rate of 49%. One returned survey was unusable. Of the forty-two usable surveys, half were from female respondents and half were from male respondents. While the response rate was singularly unimpressive, given the exploratory nature of our study, such a methodological sacrifice seems acceptable.

Reports of Sexual Harassment. The report on sexual harassment was a further modification of Szwapa's version of the Sexual Experiences Questionnaire (SEQ). Szwapa refined the original SEQ to make it more specific to the debate experience (41-44). In modifying the scale for the current study, we made two adjustments to Szwapa's SEQ. First, we eliminated potential confusion by asking questions separately for debaters and coaches. For example, the original survey asked respondents if they "have ever been in a situation where a debater and/or coaches told suggestive stories or offensive jokes." Such combined questions were deemed problematic since the status of the offender is "one of the most important situational characteristics" (Frazier, Cochran & Olson 22). Accordingly, we replaced the combined questions with individual questions regarding debaters and coaches as instigators. This expanded the SEQ to twenty-two individual items, but enabled us to better pinpoint the source of the perceived sexual harassment. Second, we extended the range of responses from Szwapa's three-point scale of "never," "once," and "more than once," to an eleven-point Likert scale, a modification that helped us to more discretely

measure the reports of sexual by increasing the variance range. This had the effect of broadening the scope of statistical techniques available to analyze the data. The individual SEQ scale items are listed in Appendix A.

Table 1
Reported Sexual Harassment (Debaters)

Item	Gender	Mean	*F*	Sig
Stories	Male	5.33	.77	ns
	Female	5.52		
Unwanted	Male	2.52	.00	ns
	Female	2.57		
Bribed	Male	.38	.03	ns
	Female	.47		
Touch	Male	.71	.42	ns
	Female	1.19		
Gender	Male	2.33	9.73	.00
	Female	5.67		
Sexual Matters	Male	1.38	2.73	.10
	Female	3.00		
Seduction	Male	.57	.43	ns
	Female	1.00		
Promises	Male	.00	1.00	ns
	Female	.47		
Consequences	Male	.00	2.14	ns
	Female	.76		
Fondle	Male	.47	.00	ns
	Female	.42		
Retaliation	Male	.00	1.59	ns
	Female	.62		

Dependent Measure. The Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale, a ten item, four-point (1 = strongly agree, 4 = strongly disagree) scale, was used to measure global self-esteem. The Rosenberg scale is one of the most widely used measures of self-esteem with acceptable reliability levels (Marsh, Barnes & Richards 196). The individual self-esteem scale items are listed in Appendix A.

Independent Measures. Three independent measures were constructed for this research: total support of staff, debater support, and coach's support scales. The social support scale consisted of six items on a seven-point Likert type scale (1 = strongly agree and 7 = strongly disagree). The anchors on each of these scales were reversed during statistical analyses so that high numbers reflected high support while low numbers represented low levels of perceived support. The individual social support scale items are listed in Appendix A.

Table 2
Reported Sexual Harassment (Coaches)

Item	Gender	Mean	*F*	Sig
Stories	Male Female	3.57 4.80	1.07	ns
Unwanted	Male Female	1.33 1.81	.24	ns
Bribed	Male Female	.23 .57	.39	ns
Touch	Male Female	.00 .90	2.33	ns
Gender	Male Female	1.33 4.80	9.60	.00
Sexual Matters	Male Female	.57 1.90	2.42	ns
Seduction	Male Female	.00 .45	1.05	ns
Promises	Male Female	.00 .75	1.98	ns
Consequences	Male Female	.00 1.00	3.44	.07
Fondle	Male Female	.00 .50	1.95	ns
Retaliation Female .59	Male	.00	1.00	ns

Analysis. Given the exploratory nature of the study and the small sample size, the latter of which attenuates power (Cohen 12), alpha was set at a fairly liberal .10 in order to better

detect meaningful differences, a protocol endorsed by Pedhazur (34). To analyze the data, the relationships between sexual harassment and support of staff and the relationship between sexual harassment and self-esteem were subjected to simple linear regression to cull out the effect of each variable independently and to overcome problems of multi-collinearity.

Results

Reports of Sexual Harassment. As predicted in H1, the Oneway ANOVA detected a main effect for gender, $F = 4.06$, $p < .09$. A paired comparison between reports of experiences with sexual harassment instigated by debaters and sexual harassment instigated by coaches revealed that debaters revealed that debaters were perceived as engaging in significantly more harassing behavior than were coaches, $t = 3.52$, $p < .001$.

Our item-by-item analysis revealed four specific instances in which women were significantly more likely than men to report experiences with sexual harassment: Women were more likely to report that they were treated differently by other debaters because of their gender, $F = 9.73$, $p < .00$. Women were more likely to report unwarranted attempts by other debaters to draw them into discussions of personal or sexual matters, $F = 2.73$, $p < .10$. Women were more likely to report that they were treated differently by coaches because of their gender, $F = 9.60$, $p < .00$. Women were more likely to report having experienced negative consequences from a coach for sexual non-cooperation, $F = 3.44$, $p < .07$. No other individual items produced statistically significant differences between women and men respondents. Table 1 (Debaters) and Table 2 (Coaches) report mean levels of perceived sexual harassment for each of the eleven items on our modified SEQ.

Sexual Harassment and Social Support. The data also lend some support for H2. Overall, when women reported high sexual harassment, they reported low support from their teammates in general, $r = -.66$, $p < .002$. Women who reported high sexual harassment also reported low help from their teammates with respect to arguments and evidence, $r = -.61$, $p < .007$). This pattern held with respect to sexual harassment instigated by debaters. High reports of sexual harassment were negatively correlated with support from teammates in general, $r = -.50$, $p < .007$, and high reports of sexual harassment were negatively correlated with help from teammates with respect to arguments and evidence, $r = -.48$, $p < .05$. Table 3 presents the correlations between social support and reported sexual harassment.

Table 3
Correlations between Sexual Harassment and Social Support

Support Group	Gender	*r*	Sig
Teammates	Male	.07	ns
	Female	-.66	.002
Coaches	Male	.00	ns
	Female	-.38	ns
Other Debaters	Male	.13	ns
	Female	-.09	ns
Evidence (Teammates)	Male	.05	ns
	Female	-.61	.007
Evidence (Coaches)	Male	-.06	ns
	Female	-.46	.06
Administration	Male	.03	ns
	Female	-.12	ns

Sexual Harassment and Self-Esteem. The data support H3 with respect to women respondents. For the entire sample, reports of sexual harassment were negatively correlated with self-esteem, with women accounting for most of the variance $F = 4.02$, $p < .06$. The self-esteem of women respondents was significantly negatively correlated with reports of sexual harassment in general, $r = -.43$, $p < .06$, and with reports of sexual harassment instigated by coaches, $r = .42$, $p < .06$. The self-esteem of women respondents also was negatively correlated with reports of sexual harassment instigated by other debaters, but the correlation was not statistically significant. Table 4 reports the correlations between reports of sexual harassment and self-esteem.

Table 4
Correlations between Sexual Harassment and Self-Esteem

Support Group	Gender	*r*	Sig
Harassed by Debater	Male	-.15	ns
	Female	-.25	ns
Harassed by Coach	Male	-.10	ns
	Female	-.42	.06
Reported Harassment	Male	-.04	ns
	Female	-.43	.06

Social Support and Self-Esteem. The data partially support H4. Reported self-esteem was positively correlated with support from teammates in general, $r = .64$, $p < .003$, and with support from teammates in respect to arguments and evidence, $r = .48$, $p < .03$. Positive correlations between social support and self-esteem were also found for support by coaches, debaters from other teams, and the administration. However, those correlations were not statistically significant and cannot be interpreted as further support for H4. Table 5 reports the correlations between social support and self-esteem.

Table 5
Correlations between Social Support and Self-Esteem

Support Group	Gender	*r*	Sig
Teammates	Male	-.08	ns
	Female	.64	.003
Coaches	Male	-.17	ns
	Female	.20	ns
Other Debaters	Male	-.20	ns
	Female	.17	ns
Evidence (Teammates)	Male	-.12	ns
	Female	.48	.03
Evidence (Coaches)	Male	-.17	ns
	Female	.36	ns
Administration	Male	-.08	ns
	Female	.14	ns

Discussion

Each of the hypotheses received some support. Women perceived significantly more sexual harassment than men and reports of sexual harassment were negatively correlated with support of staff for women in various situations. Reports of sexual harassment tended to be negatively correlated with self-esteem for women, whereas support of staff and self-esteem were positively related. In the final sections, these findings are synthesized and suggestions for future research are offered.

The significant difference between men's and women's reports of sexual harassment is consistent with other research in intercollegiate debate (See Stepp & Simerly; Logue 39; Szwapa 43-44) In fact, the overwhelming majority of literature supports "the repeated

finding that women and men disagree in their evaluations of social-sexual conduct" (Wiener 169). The current study, then, adds to a growing body of literature confirming the fact that men and women disagree in their perceptions of sexual harassment. Taken in conjunction with previous research, our study indicates that the chasm between the men's and women's perceptions of what constitutes sexual harassment remains consistent over time.

Numerous explanations for the difference between men's and women's reports of sexual harassment have been proposed. For example, Dougherty argues that men and women appraise sexual harassment from different standpoints:

> Not only are women more strongly influenced by sexual harassment, but they experience it as more perpetual and ongoing. Men may experience moments of fear but that fear ends when the experience ends. Because women recognize the ongoing implications of sexual harassment, while men still view sexual harassment as situation, men's and women's standpoints will be very different. (24)

Our data confirm that men and women do have different viewpoints about sexual harassment. Men see fewer incidents of sexual harassment and, thus, report it differently. Furthermore, while reports of sexual harassment are negatively correlated with women's self-esteem, a similar correlation was not detected for men.

Another explanation for the difference between men's and women's reports of sexual harassment is in the different concepts of power used by men and (Dougherty 14). Bargh and Raymond report that power and dominance undergirds men's need to harass, but most men are not consciously aware of their need to dominate others. "The lack of awareness many men have of the important role that their power over a woman plays in their interpretation of her behavior and their own behavior toward her is an important obstacle in changing such behavior" (93). Closely related to this difference in concepts of power is the difference suggested earlier that women perceive interpersonal relationships differently than do men. Women are socialized to prefer collectivistic power not individualistic power (Josephs, Tafarodi & Markus 391).

In intercollegiate debate, the notion of power is critical for debate fosters a culture of competition. To illustrate this point more vividly, consider a statement Szwapa attributes to a female debater: "In rounds I have been called babe, girl, honey, sweetie. I have been talked down to, called stupid and even touched. I've been winked at, and have had judges tell disgusting jokes in front of me and my partner (who is also a woman) in rounds" (44). While it is clearly undesirable and patently offensive to call women in debate rounds

"babes," or any other gendered reference, whoever made these statements accomplished a strategic goal: he forced her to think about issues unrelated to the debate round and got her off the topic; or in a different parlance, established his power and dominance in the round. In this case, the effect of the behavior might be sexual harassment, but "much of sexual harassment may be driven by the unintended and nonconscious operation of the mental representation of sexuality" (Bargh & Raymond 87). In other words, it appears as though men engage in a strategy of winning, whether consciously or not, that contains sexist undertones. The strategy of getting women off the topic might be neutral in its sexual intent, but the strategy could have a deleterious effect on women's self-esteem and self-concepts in intercollegiate debate. A male in this situation would undoubtedly argue that he was trying to gain a strategic advantage that had little or nothing to do with gender. The goal might be distraction rather than intentional sexual harassment.

Regardless of the intent of questionable in-round behavior, one result might be a decrease in the participation rates of women. To address the question of how sexual harassment is related to low participation in intercollegiate debate by women, we begin with what we know. First, women participate in intercollegiate debate in significant numbers (Stepp 117). However, high female participation tends to be short lived. Rogers found a "50% to 75% drop in subdominant [women and minorities] group member participation and success when they became eligible to compete in the Open Division" (5). Second, our evidence suggests that there is a negative correlation between reports of sexual harassment and self-esteem, a finding that indicates that sexual harassment decreases the self-esteem and negatively impacts the self- concepts of female debaters. Third, our evidence indicates that women, to some degree, appear to require supportive behaviors more so than men. Compounding the lack of social support may be the perception that sexual harassment exists which leads to a low self-esteem. A lack of social support during times of lowered self-esteem may be a clue into why women do not advance and stay in the open division of intercollegiate as much as men. Couple this with high levels of perceived sexual harassment and you have an environment which seems intolerant of women. In fact, some women do find the culture unrewarding for them and search out and find other activities on campus more rewarding.

Implications for Future Research

Future research would benefit from conducting a similar study with a larger sample, perhaps at one of the national tournaments. Replicating the current study would increase the likelihood that we might find some ways to decrease the perception that sexual harassment exists in intercollegiate debate. In addition, a larger sample would allow a more rigorous alpha level that would be consistent with mainstream social science methods. Finally, a larger sample would allow researchers to examine race as a variable in male and female perceptions of sexual harassment. The original design of this study include a race demographic. However, subgroup sample sizes were too small for meaningful analysis, even for a pilot study. Nevertheless, the limited data did document a difference in perceptions of sexual harassment by race, suggesting that evaluating the race variable might well be productive.

While we have made several methodological improvements to the SEQ, further refinement is needed. Experience with the pilot suggests three such changes. First, future researchers need to eliminate the double-barreled nature of some of the questions. For example, when we asked, "Have you ever been in a situation where a debater told suggestive stories or offensive jokes?" we ought to have asked two separate questions, one dealing with stories and the other dealing with offensive jokes. The question as currently configured does not enable respondents to separate out suggestive stories from offensive jokes.

Second, future researchers should also consider an "intensity measure" that might better gauge the relevance of sexist behavior. Such a measure might better identify those behaviors that are most offensive. It might also better explain the enormous differences between men's and women's perceptions of sexual harassment.

Third, the support of staff scale, expressly devised for this research, needs further methodological attention. For example, future researchers would benefit by specifying what supportive behaviors are, to wit: writing letters of recommendation, assigning teammates, choosing participants for "elite" tournaments, and the like. Future researchers might also attempt to determine in what contexts sexual harassment is likely to occur because "sexual harassment may be more likely to occur in situations where it is perceived as socially permissible" (Pryor, Giedd & Williams 70) and is more frequent at parties, where alcohol is present, inhibitions are reduced, and sexual thoughts occupy center stage (Simerly & McGee 10).

Specifically, debate educators should pay special attention to the type of environment created on their squads. Our findings suggest that inclusion is best fostered by the various dimensions of support of staff. Starting with coaches, we must better identify the types of supportive behavior that engender participation, that enhance recruitment, and that make women feel comfortable and included in the activity. We need to find ways to foster positive interdependence. Doing so will likely increase the participation rates of women and minorities. What is most telling is that the very activity that should promote a high self-concept among women and minorities does not due to lack of social support and the presence of a climate that clearly emphasizes individualistic concepts of self over collectivistic concepts of self. Maybe, we should begin thinking about how our behaviors impact the community versus what its effect might be on "me and my team."

Appendix A – Measurement Scales

Modified Szwapa SEQ Scale Items

1. Have you ever been in a situation where a debater told suggestive stories or offensive jokes?
2. Have you ever been in a situation where a coach told suggestive stories or offensive jokes?
3. Have you ever been in a situation where a debater made unwarranted attempts to draw you into a discussion of personal or sexual matters?
4. Have you ever been in a situation where a coach made unwarranted attempts to draw you into a discussion of personal or sexual matters?
5. Have you ever felt that you were being subtly bribed with some sort of reward to engage in sexual behavior with a debater?
6. Have you ever felt that you were being subtly bribed with some sort of reward to engage in sexual behavior with a coach?
7. Have you ever been in a situation where a debater made forceful attempts to touch, kiss or grab you.
8. Have you ever been in a situation where a coach made forceful attempts to touch, kiss or grab you?
9. Have you ever felt that you were being treated different by a debater due to gender?
10. Have you ever felt that you were being treated differently by a coach due to gender?
11. Have you ever been subject to sexist remarks concerning your participation in debate by debaters?
12. Have you ever been subject to sexist remarks concerning your participation in debate by coaches?
13. Have you ever experienced unwanted seductive behaviors from debaters?
14. Have you ever experienced unwanted seductive behaviors from coaches?
15. Have you ever engaged in unwanted sexual behavior due to promises or rewards by a debater?

16. Have you ever engaged in unwanted sexual behavior due to promises or rewards by a coach?
17. Have you ever experienced negative consequences for sexual non-cooperation from a debater?
18. Have you ever experienced negative consequences for sexual non-cooperation from a coach?
19. Have you ever been in a situation where a debater made an unwanted attempt to touch or fondle you?
20. Have you ever been in a situation where a coach made an unwanted attempt to touch or fondle you?
21. Have you ever received subtle threats of retaliation for sexual non-cooperation from a debater?
22. Have you ever received subtle threats of retaliation for sexual non-cooperation from a coach?

Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale Items

1. I feel that I am a person of worth, at least on equal basis with others.
2. I feel that I have a number of good qualities.
3. All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure.
4. I am able to do things as well as most other people.
5. I feel I do not have much to be proud of.
6. I take a positive attitude toward myself.
7. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.
8. I wish I could have more respect for myself.
9. I certainly feel useless at times.
10. At times I think I am no good at all.

Social Support Scale Items

1. Debaters on my team are very supportive.
2. Coaches on my team are very supportive.
3. Debaters on other teams are very supportive.
4. Debaters on my team are willing to help me with evidence and arguments.
5. Coaches on my team are willing to help me with evidence and arguments.
6. My school's administration is very supportive.

Works Cited

Bargh, John A. and Paula Raymond. "The Naive Misuse of Power: Nonconscious Sources of Sexual Harassment." *Journal of Social Issues* 51 (1995): 85-96.

Bisecker, Barbara. "Coming to Terms with Recent Attempts to Write Women into the History of Rhetoric." *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 25 (1992): 140-161.

Bjork, Rebecca and Robert Trapp. "Sexual Harassment in Intercollegiate Debate: Introduction." *Argumentation and Advocacy* 31 (1994): 34-35.

Donawerth, Jane. "Transforming the History of Rhetorical History." *Feminist Teacher* 7 (1993): 35-39.

Dougherty, Debbie. "Standpoint Theory and Sexual Harassment." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Communication Association. San Diego. November 1997.

Dow, Bonnie J. "Feminism, Difference(s), and Rhetorical Studies." *Communication Studies* 46 (1995): 106-117.

Flores, Lisa A. "Creating Discursive Space through a Rhetoric of Difference: Chicana Feminists Craft a Homeland." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 82 (1996): 142-156.

Frazier, Patricia A., Caroline C. Cochran, and Andrea M. Olson. "Social Science and Lay Definitions of Sexual Harassment." *Journal of Social Issues* 51 (1995): 21-37.

Greenstreet, Robert, Kate Joeckel, Janna Martin, and Karen Piercy. "The Gender-Based experience of Women in Intercollegiate Forensics." *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta* 83 (1998): 1-21.

Griffin, Cindy L. "The Essentialist Roots of the Public Sphere: A Feminist Critique." *Western Journal of Communication* 60 (1996): 21-39.

Hobfoll, Stevan E. *The Ecology of Stress*. Washington, DC: Hemisphere, 1988.

Johnson, D. W. and R. T. Johnson. *Cooperation and Competition: Theory and Research*. Edina, MN: Interaction Book Company, 1989.

Josephs, Robert A., Hazel R. Markus, and Roman W. Tafarodi. "Gender and Self-Esteem." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 64 (1992): 391-402.

Katz, Roger C., Roseann Hannon, and Leslie Whitten. "Effects of Gender and Situation on the Perception of Sexual Harassment." *Sex Roles: A Journal Of Research* 34 (1996) 35-42.

Kolb, Deborah M. and Linda L. Putnam. "Through the Looking Glass. Negotiation Theory Refracted through the Lens of Gender." Ed. Sandra E. Gleason. *Workplace Dispute*

Resolution. Directions for the 21st Century. East Lansing: Michigan State Press, 1997.

Marsh, Herbert W., Jennifer Barnes, and Gary E. Richards. "Positive and Negative Global Self-Esteem. A Substantively Meaningful Distinction or an Artifact." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 51 (1986): 195-204.

Martinez, Rueben and Richard L. Dukes. "Ethnic and Gender Differences in Self-Esteem." *Youth and Society* 22 (1991): 313-338.

Pedhazur, Elezar J. *Multiple Regression in Behavioral Research: Explanation and Prediction.* Fort Worth: Hold, Rinehart and Winston, 1982.

Pryor, John B., Janet L. Giedd, and Karen B. Williams. "A Social Psychological Model for Predicting Sexual Harassment." *Journal of Social Issues* 51 (1995): 69-84.

Pugliesi, Karen, and Scott L. Shook. "Gender, Ethnicity, and Network Characteristics: Variation in Social Support Resources." *Sex Roles: A Journal of Research* 38 (1998): 215-238.

Rogers, Jack E.. "A Community of Unequals: An Analysis of Dominant and Subdominant Culturally Linked Perceptions of Participation and Success within Intercollegiate Competitive Debate." *Contemporary Argumentation and Debate* 18 (1997): 1-22.

Roloff, Michael E. *Interpersonal Communication: The Social Exchange Approach.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 1981.

Simerly Greg, and Brian McGee. "Sexual Harassment in Intercollegiate Debate III: Participants' Perceptions." Paper presented at the meeting of the Central States Speech Communication Association. New Orleans. November 1997.

Stepp, Pamela., Greg Simerly, and Brenda Logue. "Sexual Harassment in CEDA Debate." *Argumentation and Advocacy* 31 (1994): 36-40.

Stepp, Pamela. "Response to Beattie: A Word from the President of the Cross-Examination Debate Association." *STAM Journal* 26 (1996): 117-119.

Szwapa, Cynthia A. "Sexual Harassment and Gender Discrimination in NDT Debate." *Argumentation and Advocacy* 31 (1994): 41-44.

Wiener, Richard L. "Social Analytic Jurisprudence in Sexual Harassment Litigation: The Role of Social Framework and Social Fact." *Journal of Social Issues* 51 (1995): 167-180.

Wilkins, Amanda M. and Jeffrey Hobbs. "The Prevalence of Patriarchy in Debate." *Contemporary Argumentation and Debate* 22 (1997): 34-56.

CONTEMPORARY ARGUMENTATION AND DEBATE
21 (2000): 53-73

DEBUNKING MINI-MAX REASONING: THE LIMITS OF EXTENDED CAUSAL CHAINS IN CONTEST DEBATING

David M. Berube

To employ a mathematical analogy, we can say that although the risk of extinction may be fractional, the stake is, humanly speaking, infinite, and a fraction of infinity is still infinity.
– Jonathan Schell

The lifeblood of contemporary contest debating may be the extended argument. An extended argument is any argument requiring two or more distinct causal or correlational steps between initial data and ending claim. We find it associated with advantages to comparative advantage cases, with counterplan advantages, with disadvantages, permutation and impact turnarounds, some kritik implications, and even probabilistic topicality arguments. In practice, these often are not only extended arguments, they are causal arguments using mini-max reasoning. Mini-max reasoning is defined as an extended argument in which an infinitesimally probable event of high consequence is assumed to present a highly consequential risk. Such arguments, also known as low-probability high-consequence arguments, are commonly associated with "risk analysis." The opening statement from Schell represents a quintessential mini-max argument. Schell asked his readers to ignore probability assessment and focus exclusively on the impact of his claim. While Schell gave very specific reasons why probability is less important than impact in resolving this claim, his arguments are not impervious to rebuttal.

What was a knotty piece of evidence in the 1980s kick-started a practice in contest debating which currently is evident in the ubiquitous political capital disadvantage code-named "Clinton." Here is an example of the Clinton disadvantage. In theory, plan action causes some tradeoff (real or imaginary) that either increases or decreases the President's ability to execute a particular agenda. Debaters have argued the following: Clinton (soon to be Gore or Bush) needs to focus on foreign affairs. A recent agreement between Barak and Assad needs presidential stewardship. The affirmative plan shifts presidential focus to Nigeria that trades off with focus on the Middle East. As a result, the deal for the return of the Golan Heights to Syria fails. Violence and conflict ensues as Hizbollah terrorists launch

David M. Berube (Ph.D. New York University) is an Associate Professor of Speech Communication and Director of Debate at the University of South Carolina.