AN ANALYSIS OF CEDA AND NDT JUDGING PHILOSOPHIES

Mike Allen
Michigan State University

Lisa Dowdy
Michigan State University

CEDA was founded as an alternative to standard practices in NDT many thought detrimental to good speaking.[1] If CEDA is to maintain its popularity and utility, it ought to continue emphasizing those parts of debating that make the activity different from NDT. This is not a case of CEDA _versus_ NDT, but a case of CEDA _and_ NDT. The focus of each activity is on different skills. CEDA's growing popularity cannot be denied, but a critical question about the educational nature of the activity is, how different from NDT is CEDA in the focus of skills developed?

The most critical feature in debate is the judge. Debaters and coaches in the quest for ballots adapt to judges.[2] If debaters believe there are techniques and/or arguments that will aid them on their way to victory, they will use them. Research by Pearce suggests that debaters are fairly quick learners, after two ballots they start to adapt to the individual judge.[3] If judges are different in the manner in which they judge NDT and CEDA then the debaters will debate differently.

Studies[4] looking at ballot characteristics between NDT and CEDA are useful in suggesting how the two activities differ. Such studies have typically found that the two activities produce different ballots. CEDA ballots have more delivery oriented comments made on them when compared to NDT ballots. However, many important comments and ideas get left off the ballots written by judges. Most judges have an 8 or 6 round commitment and must fill out their ballots before receiving their own teams' results. Judges often write brief and harried ballots. More importantly, the general premises on which they judged the round often become lost in the specific arguments of the round and seldom make it on the ballot.

Ballots determine the techniques debaters ultimately adopt. While much experimentation occurs, those "successful" trials are those that win ballots. Success means imitation, the standards and practices of the winning teams will be imitated by others to capture that element that led to victory. Judges' ballots educate very crudely by indicating the overall impact of all the elements that go into one specific debate.

Several studies have compared NDT and CEDA by looking at responses to questionnaires.[5] These were usually done with Likert type statements that require a forced choice. Debate coaches/judges almost invariably want to hedge

on general issues based on the particular topic or "what happens in the round." A Likert statement may be ambiguous given the inability to express all the possible positions. These studies often asked judges to compare either explicitly or implicitly CEDA and NDT. While such a comparison is good for contrasting the two activities, it tells little about the merits of a theoretical position as applied to a single activity.

A comparison of NDT and CEDA philosophies was undertaken in this paper because it was felt that philosophies written for actual tournament use would be far more useful in analyzing the differences. When writing a general philosophy, a judge has more time to fully express himself. Philosophies also have the advantage of showing what the activities are like in general, as well as contrasting them.

Both the NDT and the Lee Garrison UCLA Tournament have judges write a philosophy before the tournament begins. These are distributed before the tournament to aid the debaters. The booklets for the 1982 tournaments were used in this analysis. All 25 CEDA judging philosophies were used along with 47 randomly selected NDT judging philosophies. Two coders coded every philosophy on each of the ten items, with inter-coder agreement over all the items of 93%. The ten items and the possible choices (in parentheses) were:

1. General judging paradigm (skills, tabula rasa, policy, other)

2. Whether the judge explicitly assigned the burden of topicality to the affirmative or negative (assigned, unassigned)

3. What standard would be used to judge definitions used in topicality arguments (best definition, reasonable definition, other/not mentioned)

4. Comments on the speed of presentation (any speed, not fast, other/not mentioned)

5. Whether or not the judge mentioned courtesy (yes, no)

6. Whether or not humor was mentioned in the philosophy (yes, no)

7. Whether or not counterplans were a permissible strategy (yes, no)

8. Whether or not the judge asked for evidence citations to be read in the round (yes, no)

9. Was the quality of evidence mentioned as a criteria for a good argument (yes, no)

10. If the judge would read evidence after the round (yes, no/not mentioned)

It should be mentioned that several categories had to be collapsed because the cell size was insufficient. The results were analyzed using the appropriate Chi Square statistic.[6]

The results show that for paradigms and topicality issues, the two activities did not differ significantly. Differences were found on the categories dealing with presentational issues. CEDA judging philosophies emphasized significantly more courtesy ($x^2=3.86$, $p < .05$), slower rates of presentation ($x^2=6.38$, $p < .05$), more humor ($x^2=6.58$, $p < .05$), and better quality of evidence ($x^2=11.43$, $p < .05$) as factors in debate decisions. Not surprisingly, more judges were less receptive to counterplans in CEDA debate ($x^2=6.41$, $p < .05$). The need for citations of evidence to be read was not significantly different than NDT.

The results are encouraging for several reasons. First, there is a clear difference along several lines between NDT and CEDA, most relating to delivery. (This is not to say that if judges choose not to mention an item on their philosophy that they are opposed to the introduction of courtesy or humor into a debate.) However, the more explicitly such considerations are mentioned in a philosophy the more likely the debaters are to adopt the practice. Conversely, an omission by the judge will probably lead to an omission by the debater. If a judge does not consider the issue important enough to put on his philosophy, a debater will be inclined to consider the matter unimportant as well.

CEDA shows a preference for a slower rate of delivery with better evidence. This finding is also reflected in the tenth category, where judges do not address the issue of reading evidence after the round ($x^2=9.78$, $p < .05$). If the rate of delivery is slow enough to be comprehensible then there is no need to read evidence after the round. If understood completely, evidence can also be assessed with a more critical eye for quality. This should be beneficial since the practice of requiring better evidence should lead to higher quality argumentation. Rather than stressing evidence less than NDT, CEDA judges stress that evidence be of higher quality.

The philosophies definitely show differences between the two activities. However, this does not mean a majority of CEDA judges are different from NDT judges in the way they view the activity. Only for two questions did the NDT/CEDA philosophies differ not only statistically but directionally from each other. Those were the questions regarding speed and quality of evidence. On all other questions where a difference existed, there were still a majority of NDT and CEDA judges in agreement. While a change in emphasis on speed of delivery and quality of evidence is important there ought to be more emphasis on other skills as well.

This finding differs from past efforts at studying the differences between NDT and CEDA. The findings show that while the two activities were statistically different, the differences were less meaningful than the experimenters had hoped. This may be due to subtle differences in how the two activities view issues such as topicality. Certainly one would expect that a CEDA debate using the same terminology about theory would approach topicality differently than in NDT debate. Also argumentation and debate in general will share several common features because they are public speaking and rhetorical activities. The changes will probably be in degree more than in kind. But it is the degree of, as Jack Howe stresses, "the balance between speaking skill and argument content" that is at stake. CEDA philosophies not only stress public speaking skill but contrary to its critics, CEDA stresses the quality of proof of argument more than NDT.

Both sets of philosophies lack clearly articulated positions on some critical issues. Statements like "I hate squirrels," tells everyone very little about what a "squirrel" is, particularly when the next line of the paragraph is invariable, "standards should be argued in the round." The resulting frustration for debaters under competitive pressure was probably greater than for the coders trying to make sense of such inconsistency.

If CEDA can offer a change further improving it would be to have the judges articulate useful philosophies, including explicit standards on how to defend and refute positions, and what forms of proof are most convincing to the judge. The results show far more diversity among CEDA judges than NDT judges. Debaters must adapt every round to the demands of the individual judge. Diversity is a strength and a weakness. Diversity means difference, that judges are human beings and each one is unique. It also means inconsistency, what works for Judge A may not work for Judge B. This increases the need for judging philosophy booklets, oral critiques, open pre-tournament judges forums, and approachability on the part of judges to respond to questions regarding the manner in which they view arguments and presentational skills.

Finally, debaters should take it upon themselves to find out about judges. Every public speaking text admonishes speakers to undertake audience analysis by asking questions, whenever possible, of potential audience members. If debaters will strive to ask judges about their particular preferences, the educational aspect of the activity will be improved by opening a dialog between the students and the judges (educators) before the ballots inform teams of

their errors. Such a dialog also benefits the judge by allowing him to evaluate a debate between two teams exhibiting the skills he sees as most important. Such a dialog benefits the debater, in that he learns a variety of skills, including a sensitivity for the lonely silent person with a ballot in the back of the room.

REFERENCES

[1]Jack Howe, "CEDA's Objectives: Lest We Forget," in The Philosophy and Practice of CEDA, edited by Don Brownlee, CEDA, 1981.

[2]Rudolph Verderber, "Judges Criteria and Debater Adaptation: Empirical Evidence," Journal of the American Forensic Association, 1968, 5, 28-30.

[3]W. Barnett Pearce, "Communicating the Reasons for Decision by Ballot," Journal of the American Forensic Association, 1969, 6, 73-7.

[4]Thomas Hollihan, Patricia Riley, and Curtis Austin, "A Content Analysis of Selected CEDA and NDT Judges Ballots," in Argument in Transition: Proceedings of the Third Summer Conference on Argumentation, edited by David Zarefsky, Malcolm O. Sillars and Jack Rhodes (Annandale, Virginia: Speech Communication Association, 1983.)

[5]David C. Buckley, "A Comparison of Judging Paradigms," in Argument in Transition; Wayne Thompson, Dale Hample, Steve Hunt, and Robert Pruett, "What is CEDA Debate?" and Robert Norton, "Empirical Evidence on the Judging Criteria in Use in CEDA," both in The Forensic, Spring 1981.

[6]Sidney Siegel, Nonparametric Statistics, NY: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1956.

STATISTICAL RESULTS

Question	CEDA actual (expected)		NDT actual (expected)		X_2
1. Paradigm					
Skills	2	(4.2)	10	(7.8)	7.74
Policy	4	(7.3)	17	(13.7)	df=3
Tabula Rasa	7	(4.9)	7	(9.1)	
Other	12	(8.7)	13	(16.3)	
2. Topicality Burdens					
Assigned	8	(7.7)	14	(14.5)	.22
Unassigned	17	(17.4)	33	(32.6)	df=1
3. Topicality Standard					
Best	2	(3.5)	8	(6.5)	4.90
Reasonable	4	(6.6)	15	(12.4)	df=2
Other/Not Mentioned	19	(14.9)	24	(28.1)	
4. Speed					
Any	8	(10.4)	22	(19.6)	6.38*
Not Fast	7	(3.5)	3	(6.5)	df=2
Not Mentioned	10	(11.1)	22	(20.9)	
5. Courtesy					
Yes/Mentioned	10	(6.9)	10	(13.1)	3.86*
No/Not Mentioned	15	(18.1)	37	(33.9)	df=1
6. Humor Mentioned					
Yes	8	(4.5)	5	(8.5)	6.58*
No	17	(20.5)	42	(38.5)	df=1
7. Counterplans Permissible					
Yes	17	(21.2)	44	(39.8)	6.41*
No/Not Mentioned	8	(3.8)	3	(7.2)	df=1
8. Evidence Citations to be Read in a Round					
Yes	7	(7.3)	14	(13.7)	.01
No	18	(17.7)	33	(33.2)	df=1
9. Evidence Quality					
Mentioned	13	(7.3)	8	(13.7)	11.43*
Not Mentioned	12	(17.7)	39	(33.2)	df=1
10. Read Evidence After the Round					
Yes	5	(11.8)	29	(22.2)	9.78*
No	20	(13.2)	18	(24.8)	df=1

*p < .05