

THE PRODUCTION OF A FILMED MESSAGE CONCERNING  
THE USE OF STOCK ISSUES IN ANALYZING  
A DEBATE RESOLUTION

---

A Thesis  
Presented to  
the Faculty of the Department of Speech  
The Kansas State Teachers College  
Emporia, Kansas

---

In Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree  
Master of Science

---

by  
Larry E. Larmer  
June, 1964

Approved for the Major Department

Richard A. Hill

Approved for the Graduate Council

James C. Boyer

2000

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

| CHAPTER                                       | PAGE |
|---|------|
| I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .                     | 1    |
| The Origin . . . . .                          | 1    |
| The Problem . . . . .                         | 4    |
| Definition of Terms Used . . . . .            | 4    |
| Review of Literature . . . . .                | 6    |
| II. PROCEDURES . . . . .                      | 14   |
| Planning . . . . .                            | 14   |
| Filming and Editing . . . . .                 | 16   |
| III. EVALUATION . . . . .                     | 21   |
| Presentation of Evaluation . . . . .          | 21   |
| Interpretation of Evaluation . . . . .        | 22   |
| IV. CONCLUSIONS . . . . .                     | 26   |
| Conclusions Based on the Production . . . . . | 26   |
| Conclusions Based on the Evaluation . . . . . | 27   |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .                        | 28   |
| APPENDIX A . . . . .                          | 30   |
| APPENDIX B . . . . .                          | 32   |
| APPENDIX C . . . . .                          | 54   |

## LIST OF TABLES

| TABLE  | PAGE |
|--|------|
| I. Range of Ratings and Mean Ratings of All<br>Evaluators on Each Category Included<br>in the Evaluation Sheet . . . . . | 23   |

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

#### I. THE ORIGIN

It has been observed as a general principle that "unless the debater knows what he is trying to prove, and unless he knows that what he is trying to prove will really affirm or deny the proposition, the debating is aimless."<sup>1</sup> Evidence exists, however, that persons in a position to observe high school debating in Kansas have found that the debater often concerns himself with things which do not actually affirm or deny the proposition. As one writer reports,

. . . the weakness presents itself when the debater searching for a different approach to the topic tends as the phrase goes, "to go into left field." This is usually the result of a lack of careful analysis and research in the area of the question.<sup>2</sup>

The causes of such a condition can only be conjectured; however, available evidence points to some possibilities. According to the Lawson study, at least fourteen active debate coaches in Kansas had neither an

---

<sup>1</sup>Lionel Creeker, Argumentation and Debate (New York: American Book Company, 1944), p. 41.

<sup>2</sup>John C. DeBross, "Debating Thoughts: An Appraisal of Some Fundamental Weaknesses," Kansas Speech Journal, XXIII (November, 1961), p. 27.

undergraduate major or minor in Speech in 1962-1963.<sup>3</sup> State certification requirements for debate coaches are such that the individual in charge of a high school debate program may have very little formal academic training in debate or speech pedagogy. Consequently, it is assumed that a well-meaning high school debate coach may fail to pass on to his students the techniques and theories of good analysis simply because he himself is not aware of them.

Another possible contributing factor may be that the debate director did not have the opportunity to instruct his debaters in the various theoretical aspects of debate. It would seem that such an opportunity would best present itself if debate were included in the curricular offerings of the school system. The Lawson study further reveals, however, that at least twelve schools active in debate in 1962-1963 did not provide a course in debate as a curricular offering.<sup>4</sup>

It is important to note at this juncture that if the analysis of the proposition of high school debaters in Kansas is sometimes deficient, and if this deficiency is in

---

<sup>3</sup>Harold L. Lawson, "A Study of Factors Which Differentially Characterized Winning and Losing Kansas High School Debate Programs in 1962-1963" (unpublished Master's thesis, Kansas State Teachers College, Emporia, 1963), p. 56.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 12.

part caused by insufficient training of debate coaches in the theoretical basis of the analysis of a proposition and inadequate opportunities for high school debate coaches to present instructional information to their students, then it seems reasonable that availability of a filmed message concerning the use of stock issues may help ease each situation and contribute to the general improvement of high school debate in Kansas. As Brockriede and Ehninger point out,

A generalized method for discovering intermediate claims systematically is called the stock issues analysis. This method has two important advantages: First, because its framework represents a complete system, the debater who employs it properly is assured an exhaustive analysis of a proposition of policy. Second, because the system applies to all propositions of policy, an ability to make a stock issues analysis is cumulative.<sup>5</sup>

Additional motivation for the study came from the fact that there were relatively few textbooks available which provide instruction for the high school debater in analyzing a proposition. The writer observed many texts in the general area of argumentation and debate but few were recommended for use by high school students. It seemed that opportunities existed to expose high school debaters to theoretical information through another medium.

---

<sup>5</sup>Wayne Brockriede and Douglas Ehninger, Decision by Debate (New York: Dodd, Mead & Company, 1963), p. 223.

## II. THE PROBLEM

In light of this, the specific problem with which this thesis was concerned was the production of a filmed message to high school debate students concerning the use of stock issues in analysing a debate proposition. The problem had two major aspects. The first aspect was to create an understandable but meaningful message showing how the proper application of stock issues could lead to a more accurate analysis of the debate proposition. The second aspect was to record the message on film so that through this medium it could be made generally available to high school debaters in Kansas.

## III. DEFINITION OF TERMS USED

Stock issues. Almost every theorist in the area of argumentation and debate offers a definition of the term "stock issue." While all of them are in general agreement, Freeley is the most concise and lucid in stating "stock issues are standard questions which are applicable to almost any proposition."<sup>6</sup> Despite agreement on the general nature of stock issues, much diversity exists on the number of stock issues which could be applied to a proposition of policy.

---

<sup>6</sup>Austin J. Freeley, Argumentation and Debate (San



The problem seemed to be an arbitrary one of expression. Since the filmed message on the use of stock issues had as its primary intended receiver an audience of high school students, simplicity was maintained. Therefore the writer preferred the following explanation and itemization offered by Reid:

. . . people do not usually accept a new policy unless they are dissatisfied with the present system, unless there is some "felt need" to change the present way of doing things. Thus, the first stock issue in a proposition of policy is the need issue, which asks whether present conditions are unsatisfactory enough to warrant a change from present policy.

The existence of weaknesses in present policy, however, does not necessarily mean that the proposition calling for the acceptance of a specific new policy should be adopted. One must also consider whether the new proposal could appreciably improve the present system, whether it could ameliorate the problems within the status quo. Thus, the second stock issue is the practicality issue, which asks whether the new policy can solve the needs.

However, even if the new policy is both needed and practical, it might not necessarily be a desirable policy to adopt, for it might have certain "side effects" which would create problems worse than those being remedied. Thus, there is a third stock issue which considers the relative importance of the advantages versus the disadvantages which might result from putting the new proposal into operation.<sup>7</sup>

One final definitive aspect of stock issues is that "they are not the real issues in any particular proposition,

---

Francisco: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1961), p. 33.

<sup>7</sup>Ronald P. Reid, "Analysis of the Proposition," Argumentation and Debate, ed. James H. McBath (revised edition; New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1963), pp. 57-8.

but rather a formulation of questions that may prove helpful in finding the real issues."<sup>8</sup>

#### IV. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The first step in reviewing relevant literature was to examine appropriate indexes and bibliographies. The most general observation made as a result of this examination was that relatively little written information pertinent to the proposed project could be found.

It was noted that the Indiana University catalog, entitled Educational Motion Pictures revealed that there were no films available directly devoted to the specific problem of the proposed project. This catalog contained such categorical headings as "Communications," "Discussion," "Rhetoric," and "Speech." Only one title was revealed which might possibly have been concerned with the analysis of the debate proposition. That title was, "Learning to Argue More Effectively," and appeared in the "Discussion" category of the 1962 supplement. The title did not reappear in the 1963 supplement. It was concluded that there was little evidence of films available for general circulation which devoted thorough attention to the analysis of the debate proposition.

---

<sup>8</sup>James H. McBurney and Glen E. Mills, Argumentation and Debate: Techniques of a Free Society (second edition; New York: The Macmillan Company, 1964), p. 55.

The Knower index revealed that six filmed projects had been used as M.A. theses. In each case, the degree had been earned at the University of California at Los Angeles and in no case was the message of the film concerned with the field of Speech. Dissertation Abstracts also revealed project films which were used in partial fulfillment of academic degrees. The notion of a film production applied toward an academic degree was deemed not without precedent.

Many articles in professional journals were sought out and found not relevant to the project. Others, however, provided endorsements and cautions in the use and production of educational films. Jacoby certified the value of good classroom films when she stated,

It [the film] can supplement the teacher. It can provide knowledge which the classroom teacher cannot provide through lecture, discussion, or static visual aids. It can give the student experiences which will make the verbal symbols of lecture and discussion more meaningful.<sup>9</sup>

Certain critical evaluations of films provided helpful guidelines in the planning of the project. Nelson warned against the de-emphasis of the visual aspect of filming when he reported,

In both motion pictures and television it would seem that relatively greater attention should be paid to the video. If these media of mass communication have an

---

<sup>9</sup>Beatrice Jacoby, "Why Do You Use Films?" The Speech Teacher, March, 1953, p. 119.

advantage peculiar to themselves, it is in the use of the picture. With the advantages shown in this study for the video, in spite of the fact that the film was biased in favor of the audio, it would seem especially important that greater emphasis be given to the video in planning and producing instructional films or television programs.<sup>10</sup>

Ball and Whitehill<sup>11</sup> concluded from their inspection of the "Young America" films designed for speech instruction that some common complaints seemed to prevail concerning the use of the film medium. Most notable among these complaints were: (1) Too much talking by narrator with too little use of the visual element; (2) The rate of the development of ideas was too fast; (3) Too little repetition of main ideas.

One examination of the characteristics of widely-used educational films was reported in Dissertation Abstracts. This study, entitled "Design in the Educational Film: An Analysis of Production Elements in Twenty-One Widely Used Non-Theatrical Motion Pictures," was conducted by Robert Walter Wagner, Ph.D., The Ohio State University, 1953. One observation made by Wagner in his abstract which was germane to the project was that

Film making involves the judicious selection and use of various film techniques and rhetorical elements in view

---

<sup>10</sup>Harold E. Nelson, "The Relative Contributions to Learning of Video and Audio Elements in Film," Speech Monographs, March, 1951, p. 73.

<sup>11</sup>Joe M. Ball and Buell Whitehill, Jr., "A Report on the Young America Films Designed for Use in the Teaching of Speech," The Speech Teacher, March, 1953, pp. 122-123.

of the intended purpose and the intended audience rather than the mechanical application of a formula.<sup>12</sup>

Despite this admonition Wagner went on to point out that

With respect to the well-designed educational film, the following conclusions apply:

1. Its effect will be proportional to the degree to which it is based on the common interests and needs of the audience for which it is intended.
2. The vocabulary level of the audience should be kept clearly in mind in preparing film narration, but it must be recognized that what is said is seldom as important as what is shown on the screen.
3. The structure of the film should be simple enough to be understood by its intended audience. It should not contain too many different ideas, nor move too fast.
4. The rate at which the commentary is delivered should be between 100 and 130 words per minute.
5. The film may well include an introduction which clearly and succinctly poses the problem, orients the audience, and establishes "set," or a condition of readiness for the presentation.
6. Key ideas may be repeated two to four times for emphasis and reinforcement, but the repetitions should be varied and aesthetically satisfying as well. The summary is also useful as a form of repetition.
7. The running times of classroom films may vary from five to 30 minutes to fit the class period. Within this limit, the major consideration in film length will not be the capacity of a 16 mm reel, but the nature of what is said and the best manner of saying it in motion picture form.
8. It should be recognized that the motion picture experience is an active, not a passive one, and that audience involvement in any type of film is a matter of degree. The elements of identification,

---

<sup>12</sup>Robert Walter Wagner, "Design in the Educational Film: An Analysis of Production Elements in Twenty-One Widely Used Non-Theatrical Motion Pictures" (unpublished Ph.D. thesis, The Ohio State University, 1953), Dissertation Abstracts (Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, Inc., 1959), p. 171.

- familiarity [sic], anticipation, participation, and dramatic structure will be built into the film to the degree necessary to bring about that changed behavior and showing in common which marks successful communication and effective learning.
9. Color, music, sound, animation, optical, and special effects will be used selectively to simplify, amplify, and reinforce the main idea. The possible distractive influence of these factors will be studied. The subliminal effects of these elements will also be recognized and further explored.
  10. The educational film will be deliberately designed to promote the finding and testing of meanings. In such films there will be more "forked-road" situations, more use of "open endings," to make the film experience a means of promoting new and better ways of thinking and behaving.<sup>13</sup>

As far as literature involved with the message of the film was concerned, the most helpful sources were college-level textbooks in the area of argumentation and debate. Although the survey of indexes of professional journals supplied some inviting titles, these articles did not yield any usable information.

Almost all the textbooks consulted directed some attention to the use of stock issues in analyzing the proposition. Some were judged as dated and some were repetitions of others.

As stated in the "Definition of Terms Used," stock issues are not the real issues relevant to a proposition, but are merely helpful guidelines or starting points through

---

<sup>13</sup>Ibid.

which the real issues can be discovered. In fact, McBurney and Mills point out two specific reasons why stock issues should not be confused with real issues.

Why, then, are these not really the exact issues in all such cases? For two reasons it is unsafe to accept them as such: first, because analysis may show a more specific wording for these general questions, and this will aid in many ways; second, and principally, because on accurate analysis it may be found that one of these questions will break up into, say, three questions, each of which must be proved by the affirmative.<sup>14</sup>

Virtually all of the authorities have been found to be in agreement on this point.

Authorities such as Buys, Kendall and Murphy,<sup>15</sup> Kruger and Windes,<sup>16</sup> McBurney, Mills and O'Neill,<sup>17</sup> Foster,<sup>18</sup> Chenoweth,<sup>19</sup> Kruger,<sup>20</sup> and Rousse, Summers and

<sup>14</sup>McBurney and Mills, op. cit., p. 55.

<sup>15</sup>William Buys, Bruce Kendall and Jack Murphy, Discussion and Debate (Lincolnwood, Illinois: National Text-book Corporation, 1961), pp. 20-60.

<sup>16</sup>Arthur N. Kruger and Russel R. Windes, Championship Debating (Portland, Maine: J. Weston Walch, 1961), pp. 7-34.

<sup>17</sup>James H. McBurney, Glen E. Mills, and James N. O'Neill, Argumentation and Debate (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1951), pp. 30-39.

<sup>18</sup>William Trufant Foster, Argumentation and Debating, (second revised edition; Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1945), pp. 13-15.

<sup>19</sup>Eugene C. Chenoweth, Discussion and Debate, (Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Company, 1951), p. 43.

<sup>20</sup>Arthur N. Kruger, Modern Debate, (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1960), pp. 37-77.

Whan,<sup>21</sup> agreed with the sentiment of Brockriede and Ehninger who expressed a belief in the values of proper use of the stock issues. Some of them, such as Robert T. Oliver, went beyond this and found the judicious use of stock issues also of value in organization.

These stock issues are always of value to the speaker in guiding his own analysis of the subject matter, and on occasion they are useful as the outline for his speech.<sup>22</sup>

Those sources which were found to be most thorough in handling stock issues were Reid,<sup>23</sup> and Brockriede and Ehninger.<sup>24</sup> These authorities proved to be the most helpful in the creation of the filmed message.

Chapter I has dealt with the origin of the problem, the statement of the problem, definition of terms, and the review of literature. Chapter II shall be concerned with an account of the procedures planned and followed in the production of the film. Chapter III will reveal the evaluation

---

<sup>21</sup>T. A. Rousse, H. B. Summers and F. L. Whan, How to Debate, (New York: The H. W. Wilson Company, 1950), pp. 118-124.

<sup>22</sup>Robert T. Oliver, The Psychology of Persuasive Speech (second edition; New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1957), p. 234.

<sup>23</sup>Reid, op. cit., pp. 57-65.

<sup>24</sup>Brockriede and Ehninger, op. cit., pp. 223-228.



of the project, while Chapter IV shall consist of conclusions and suggestions.

## CHAPTER II

### PROCEDURES

#### I. PLANNING

The first step in the creation of the project was to devise an outline of the filmed message. The outline was accompanied by a technical plot which indicated the attention and interest devices as well as at what point in the message visual aids were to be used.

Several specifics on the design of the film were formulated at that time. For example, one particular conclusion of the Wagner study<sup>25</sup> was that the time length of the film should probably be between five and thirty minutes. On the basis of the nature of the material which was to be included in the message and the amount of amplification needed to make it clear, it was arbitrarily decided that the length of the film would be twenty to twenty-five minutes.

To assure that the technical aspects of the film would not surpass the capabilities of the available filming apparatus and to provide expediency and clarity in

---

<sup>25</sup>Robert Walter Wagner, "Design in the Educational Film: An Analysis of Production Elements in Twenty-One Widely Used Non-Theatrical Motion Pictures" (unpublished Ph.D. thesis, The Ohio State University, 1953), Dissertation Abstracts (Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, Inc., 1959), p. 171.

production, the number of individuals planned to be used in the film was held to a minimum. It was feared that the attempt to incorporate too many personalities into the film would have led to confusion and delay without significantly adding to the message. Therefore, in addition to the writer, only one personality appeared on camera. This was a student used at the beginning of the film for attention and illustrative purposes.

It was anticipated that from time to time in the presentation of the message it would be useful to refer to a particular debate proposition for purposes of explanation. To prevent any viewer from connecting the film with a particular debate year and thus tending to date the film, a proposition was formulated which had never been debated on either the high school or college level. Furthermore, it was believed that the use of a totally unfamiliar debate proposition would circumvent any viewer inference that the film had as its purpose the illustration of the writer's opinion of the real issues of a certain proposition.

After the preliminary outlining and planning had been accomplished, the next step was to make the visual aids. Attempts to utilize campus-related printing services revealed that the products of such services were not of suitable quality for filming. A professional sign-painter

was contracted to provide the visual aids. (Visual aid messages appear in Appendix A.)

As the visual aids were being made, the writer transcribed the original outline into a full script. Upon completion of the script, Mr. Charles F. Edwards, director of the technical aspects of filming, was consulted to assist in planning the specific shot sequences. The various camera angles, business, and use of properties were planned and noted on the script during that consultation. (Appendix B contains the shooting script and the aforementioned technical notations.)

After the shooting script was prepared, there was a necessary time interval of one week before filming facilities became available. This time was spent in locating properties and rehearsing the script. The rehearsals consisted primarily of committing the script to memory and tape recording it. The playbacks of the recordings provided the writer with an estimation of how appropriate vocal emphasis of the message might be attained.

## II. FILMING AND EDITING

The initial filming was undertaken as soon as the filming equipment was available. During the first session, the entire message was recorded on film in about six hours.

All the shots were taken in sequence to facilitate later editing.

When the processed film was returned the immediate task was to review the film and prepare a shot list indicating which exposures were unusable and which to splice together into a preliminary copy of the completed message. It was observed during this reviewing session that these shots which had been completed satisfactorily on the first attempt during the original filming session were, in terms of spontaneity and effective communication, better than those which had to be re-taken.

Upon completion of the editing, splicing and reviewing of the original filmstrip, it was noted that with the exception of two shots in which there were obvious technical problems caused by the camera angle or lens adjustment, the preliminary film was of sufficient quality to warrant showing it to the supervising graduate committee for recommendations on re-takes.

It was at this juncture that the first major problem of the production was encountered. The consensus was that the script should be revised to include only the "need" stock issue and that the language should be more "visual."

While preparing for another review of the preliminary copy in order to determine specifically how the committee's suggestions might be best applied, the writer discovered

that he had an available audience of several undergraduates. These undergraduates were asked to view the film and attempt to outline the message it contained. After the viewing they were asked to comment upon the effectiveness of the film as a teaching device. The comments were generally quite favorable. A survey of their attempts to outline the message revealed that they had all correctly recorded the main points of the message.

Such evidence, of course, was not considered to be sufficient endorsement of the film's utility. However, the writer did receive sufficient encouragement to arrange to show the film to two high school debate classes. A total of twenty-five high school students viewed the film and were pre-tested and post-tested in order to determine whether or not any transfer of information took place. The students ranged from zero to three years in debate experience. The over-all mean gain of information calculated from the results of the testing was 6.58 points on a fifty-point test. The mean gain of the two students who had no debate experience was 11.5. Since this data was not compiled with statistical rigor and since the test was not validated, no statistical inferences were asserted. However, the writer did believe that the evidence gathered from the testing did raise the possibility that the film was a more effective

teaching supplement than it was originally judged to be by the supervising committee.

The committee was called together and informed of the results. Although the lack of conclusive evidence of the film's utility was noted, the group did reconsider its original recommendations. Apparently, the data suggested the possibilities of the film as the object of future experimentation. In addition, sentiments expressed by individual committee members indicated that the only true measure of the project would be its use by high school instructors over a prolonged period of time. Since the original script had been approved prior to the beginning of the filming, it was advised that major revisions should be delayed until the film was tested by use.

The next immediate step in moving towards completion of the project was to re-shoot those shots which were obviously faulty and which the committee deemed ought to be re-done.

Through some technical error the sound track had been omitted from the re-takes. This necessitated a second shooting session of those shots which had to be done over. When these shots were reviewed and submitted again to the processor, they were accompanied by a list of the desired credits and instructions for splicing. This meant that the

next film to return from the processor would be the finished product.

In the meantime, the committee was asked to view the preliminary copy and submit evaluation sheets. Chapter III contains an account of the evaluating procedure.



## CHAPTER III

### EVALUATION

#### I. PRESENTATION OF EVALUATION

Although it was believed that the only accurate measure of the film's utility would be its use by high school debate instructors, some evaluation procedure at this juncture of the project was advised. One reason for the evaluation was to provide committee members with a tangible rationale for use in judging the quality of the completed project. A second reason was to forecast probable strengths and weaknesses of the film. With such a forecast having been made, the high school instructors could be asked to make specific comments verifying the strengths and to make suggestions for overcoming the weaknesses of the film.

The procedure for evaluation was to have each committee member view the preliminary copy of the film and rate each of the categories on the evaluation sheet (Appendix C). The ratings were based on a scale ranging from a low score of one to a high score of fifteen points. Each committee member viewed the film separately and no member was aware of the other ratings until his evaluation was completed.

The lowest rating on any category by any evaluator was a score of eight which was received once. The highest

rating was fifteen and was received sixteen times. The respective mean responses of the evaluators were 11.61, 12.50, 13.28, and 14.43. The mean response of all committee members rating all categories was 12.88.

Table I reveals the range of ratings and the mean rating of all evaluators on each of the categories included in the evaluation sheet.

## II. INTERPRETATION OF EVALUATION

In many cases, the committee members made oral or written comments which explained the reasons for particular ratings. For example, the evaluator whose mean rating was lowest reported that he rated the film on the basis of the preliminary copy without taking into account those shots which were being re-done.

In one instance, an evaluator gave reasons for his low ratings on the categories "Interest of Material" and "Use of Examples." As Table I reveals, these categories had the two lowest mean ratings. The committee member pointed out that the category "Interest of Material" was rated low by him because of a "formal" approach used in the film. He added that the "formal" approach may not be a drawback to debate students. The same evaluator also provided a concrete reason for his low rating of the category "Use of Examples." It was his opinion that the example used

**TABLE I**  
**RANGE OF RATINGS AND MEAN RATINGS OF ALL**  
**EVALUATORS ON EACH CATEGORY INCLUDED**  
**IN THE EVALUATION SHEET**

| Category   | Range | Mean  |
|--|-------|-------|
| <b>EVALUATION OF MESSAGE</b>                       |       |       |
| 1. Accuracy of Material                            | 14-15 | 14.66 |
| 2. Thoroughness of Material                        | 12-15 | 13.66 |
| 3. Organisation of Material                        | 14-15 | 14.66 |
| 4. Interest of Material                            | 9-13  | 11.50 |
| 5. Use of Examples                                 | 10-14 | 11.75 |
| 6. Clarity of Material                             | 11-14 | 12.75 |
| 7. Utility of Material                             | 12-15 | 13.50 |
| 8. Choice of Language                              | 10-15 | 12.25 |
| 9. Use of Visual Aids                              | 10-15 | 12.75 |
| 10. Communicability of Lecturer                    | 12-15 | 13.25 |
| 11. General Effectiveness<br>of Material           | 12-12 | 12.00 |
| <b>EVALUATION OF MEDIUM</b>                        |       |       |
| 1. Quality of Sound                                | 8-14  | 12.25 |
| 2. Absence of Distracting Elements                 | 10-14 | 12.00 |
| 3. Planning of Shot Sequences                      | 10-15 | 12.75 |
| 4. Quality of Settings                             | 10-15 | 13.25 |
| 5. Quality of Lighting                             | 9-15  | 13.25 |
| 6. Camera Emphasis of Important<br>Visual Elements | 12-15 | 13.50 |
| 7. General Effectiveness of Use<br>of Medium       | 12-15 | 12.75 |

throughout the film needed "more lively language" or "greater color in descriptive development."

Another committee member made several specific justifications for the lowest rating on the category "Choice of Language." This individual objected particularly to the use of the phrase "great deal" and the use of the single word "idea" in consecutive sentences. Both of these situations were corrected in re-takes but had not been edited into the copy of the film shown for evaluation.

The evaluator who gave the lowest rating on the "Quality of Sound" category explained that his response was prompted by a lack of synchronization of the sound track with the visual element of the film. This particular committee member was the last one to view the film for evaluative purposes and was the only one to notice a lack of synchronization. It was conjectured by the writer that the many showings of the preliminary copy with its unprofessional splicing caused the sound synchronization to be thrown off slightly.

Other than the specific comments made to clarify low ratings on the evaluation sheet, most of the committee members and outside individuals who witnessed the film provided favorable comments. There appeared to be general agreement that the film would be beneficial and general enthusiasm prevailed for the possibility of further development in the

production of instructional films for use in teaching  
debate.

## **CHAPTER IV**

### **CONCLUSIONS**

Since there was no attempt to apply statistical rigor to the evaluation of the project and since it was decided that major revisions in the film should be motivated by suggestions coming from its users, there is little evidence available at this time which suggests either the success or failure of the project regarding its usefulness to its intended audience. However, some conclusions can be drawn at this time from the writer's experience in completing the project and from the formal and informal evaluation provided by the film's viewers. It is hoped that these conclusions will be helpful to future planners of similar projects.

#### **I. CONCLUSIONS BASED ON THE PRODUCTION**

1. Tape recorded rehearsals of the script prior to filming proved helpful in determining appropriate vocal emphasis.
2. The services of a professional sign painter were required to provide appealing and clearly-constructed visual aids.
3. The filming procedure was expedited by the minimal number of individuals included in the script.
4. Those shots which were filmed correctly on the first attempt proved to be more effective than re-takes in terms of spontaneity and communicability.
5. The fact that all shots were taken in sequence during the first filming session facilitated later editing.

6. Careful notations of all details concerning the physical appearance of the lecturer immediately prior to the first filming session assured that these factors could be duplicated in those shots which had to be re-taken later.
7. Planners of future projects of this nature can avoid delay and confusion if the exact objectives of the projects are explicitly stated in the planning stages and if appropriate methods of evaluation in light of these objectives are included.

## II. CONCLUSIONS BASED ON THE EVALUATION

1. To assure clarity, extreme care must be taken as examples and amplifying materials are chosen and phrased for inclusion in the message.
2. Simple but appealing settings appear to contribute to the communicability of the filmed message.
3. Visual aids are extremely helpful in communication but their unnatural or unmeaningful handling can result in distractions.
4. Because this particular filmed message has been judged somewhat detailed and hard to follow, it is anticipated that it would be more meaningful if it were accompanied by instructions for its use.
5. All available evidence indicates that the film medium is an appropriate and functional approach to debate instruction.

## **BIBLIOGRAPHY**



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### BOOKS

- Brockriede, Wayne, and Douglas Ehninger. Decision By Debate. New York: Dodd, Mead & Company, 1963.
- Buys, William, Bruce Kendall, and Jack Murphy. Discussion and Debate. Third edition. Lincolnwood, Illinois: National Textbook Corporation, 1961.
- Chenoweth, Eugene C. Discussion and Debate. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Company, 1951.
- Crocker, Lionel. Argumentation and Debate. New York: American Book Company, 1944.
- Foster, William Trufant. Argumentation and Debating. Second revised edition. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1945.
- Freeley, Austin J. Argumentation and Debate. San Francisco: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1961.
- Kruger, Arthur N. Modern Debate. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1960.
- \_\_\_\_\_, and Russel R. Windes. Championship Debating. Portland, Maine: J. Weston Welch, 1961.
- McBurney, James H., and Glen E. Mills. Argumentation and Debate. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1964.
- \_\_\_\_\_, Glen E. Mills, and James M. O'Neill. Argumentation and Debate. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1951.
- Oliver, Robert T. The Psychology of Persuasive Speech. Second edition. New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1957.
- Reid, Ronald F. Argumentation and Debate. Revised edition. Edited by James H. McBeth. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1963.
- Rousse, Thomas Andrew, Harrison Boyd Summers, and Forest Livings Whan. How to Debate. New York: The H. W. Wilson Company, 1950.

## PERIODICALS

- Ball, Joe M., and Buell Whitehill, Jr. "A Report on the Young America Films Designed for Use in the Teaching of Speech," The Speech Teacher, XVIII (March, 1953),
- DeBross, John C. "Debating Thoughts: An Appraisal of Some Fundamental Weaknesses," Kansas Speech Journal, XXIII (November, 1961), 24-29.
- Jacoby, Beatrice. "Why Do You Use Films?" The Speech Teacher, XVIII (March, 1953), 119-121.
- Nelson, Harold E. "The Relative Contributions to Learning of Video and Audio Elements in Film," Speech Monographs, XIX (March, 1951), 70-73.
- Smith, Carney C. "Practical Procedures in Coaching High School Debate," The Quarterly Journal of Speech, XXIX (April, 1943), 222-233.
- Wagner, Robert Walter. "Design in the Educational Film: An Analysis of Production Elements in Twenty-One Widely Used Non-Theatrical Motion Pictures," Dissertation Abstracts, vol. XX, pp. 169-172. An abstract of an unpublished Ph.D. thesis. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms, Inc., 1959.

## UNPUBLISHED MATERIALS

- Lawson, Harold L. "A Study of Factors Which Differentially Characterized Winning and Losing Kansas High School Debate Programs in 1962-1963." Unpublished Master's thesis, Kansas State Teachers College, Emporia, 1963.

## **APPENDICES**

## **APPENDIX A**

## APPENDIX A

### LIST OF VISUAL AIDS USED

Visual Aid #1:

STOCK ISSUES

1. NEED
2. PLAN
3. ADVANTAGES

Visual Aid #2:

SUFFICIENT REASON  
FOR BASIC CHANGE?

Visual Aid #3:

DO PROBLEMS  
ACTUALLY EXIST?

Visual Aid #4:

DO PROBLEMS RESULT  
IN SUBSTANTIAL HARM?

Visual Aid #5:

ARE PROBLEMS CAUSED  
BY PRESENT SYSTEM?

Visual Aid #6:

SOLUTIONS IN  
PRESENT SYSTEM?

Visual Aid #7:

WILL PROPOSAL REMEDY

DEFECTS OF PRESENT SYSTEM?

Visual Aid #8:

1. WILL PLAN BE WORKABLE?

2. WILL PLAN BE EFFECTIVE?

Visual Aid #9:

DO GOOD SIDE EFFECTS

OUTWEIGH BAD SIDE EFFECTS?

## **APPENDIX B**

## APPENDIX B

### SCRIPT

---

Student: medium  
long shot

This fellow looks pretty confused, doesn't he? The fact is, he's a debater trying to understand what his debate resolution is all about. He has read a great amount of background information but it seems to be just one big blur in his mind. Every brainstorm he has leads him to a frustrating dead-end. He just can't seem to crystallize any issues out of all that hopeless maze of information.

Pan to cover shot:  
lecturer sitting  
on stool

Well actually, we can sympathize with this poor fellow. Every debater experiences this problem at one time or another. Perhaps you have the same problem right now and you want to overcome this situation.

Medium close-up

Very likely, the cause of our friend's problem, and probably



---

SCRIPT

---

the cause of yours is that there seems to be no starting place. Well, instead of waiting around for the brainstorm which may never come, let's see if we can't determine a system which might guide you toward the real issues of your debate resolution. I would like to make you aware of one particular method of analysing your debate question and finding the issues you may want to use in building a case. It would seem to me that if you approached your problem through the three traditional stock issues, need-plan-advantages, your job of analysis will be much easier.

Long shot: walk to  
easel--pick up  
pointer

Close-up

Visual aid #1

Now, I'm sure you have heard of these three elements of a debate case. You probably know that every affirmative is supposed to have a need, a plan, and advantages. What you may not know, however, is that

---

**SCRIPT**

---

these stock issues furnish critical questions which we can ask ourselves about our resolution.

Medium close-up

The

answers to these questions can reveal the actual arguments you may want to use concerning the need, plan and advantages portions of your case. I don't mean to imply that stock issues are used only by the affirmative; they are just as helpful to you when you're on the negative. Now let's look at each of the stock issues separately, and as we do, keep in mind that each one can help you understand your debate resolution better.

Pointer

The major purpose of the first stock issue, the need issue, is to determine whether or not there is sufficient reason for a basic departure from the present policy. So the first question you

---

SCRIPT

---

Visual aid #2

want to ask yourself is, "Is there sufficient reason to make a basic change?" The key words in this question are "sufficient reason" and "basic change."

In order to determine whether or not existing conditions call for a basic change, you must study carefully all the aspects of the present policy and, as you do so, ask yourself these questions: (1) Do problems actually exist? (2) Do these problems result in substantial harm? (3) Does the present policy actually cause these problems? (4) Can these problems be overcome within the scope of the present system? Now we are going to have to go over each of these things separately. Remember that we are concerned with the need issue.

Pan to include easel

Visual aid #3

Our first question was, "Do problems actually exist?"

---

SCRIPT

---

Obviously, one of the first steps to undertake when considering the possibility of changing our way of doing things is to find out if there is anything wrong with the way we do things now.

Close-up

Let's suppose, for example, you were analyzing the proposition, Resolved: "That the Kansas right-to-work law should be repealed." You would want to know, first of all, if our present policy of making it illegal to require that a person join a union in order to hold his job has presented any difficulties to anyone. So, you ask yourself the question, "Do problems actually exist?" You may recall that you have run across information which tells you that since the passage of the Kansas right-to-work law the membership in labor unions

---

**SCRIPT**

---

has sharply declined. This means that the bargaining power of unions has been subsequently reduced. This, then, may be a problem of the present system. This same procedure can be applied to the debate question you are now concerned with. You should ask yourself, "Do problems actually exist?" and list all the possible problems you can discover in the present policy.

Medium close-up

If you itemize all these possible problems you will probably have a very long list. More than likely, not all of them will be serious enough to warrant a change in policy. So, your next question will be, "Do these conditions or problems result in substantial harm?" The idea here is to determine which problems are great enough to call for a change. This idea of substantial harm can be

Visual aid #4

---

**SCRIPT**

---

approached from two directions:  
the degree of harm to a given group  
of people and the number of people  
affected.

Close-up including  
visual aid #4

Let's go back to our  
previous example. Suppose you  
found that a relatively small por-  
tion of the Kansas population is  
involved in industrial employment.  
This would mean that not many peo-  
ple are affected by right-to-work  
legislation. However, those who  
are affected may be affected very  
seriously. Perhaps the weak posi-  
tion of their union means that they  
must work for low wages and under  
unsafe conditions. So in this  
case, the harm occurs to only a few  
people but it affects these few  
very seriously. The harm here can  
be measured most accurately in  
terms of degree.

---

**SCRIPT**

---

On the other hand, you may discover that the weakness of unions affects the general population in Kansas. If the union wage scale is low, this may hold wages down in all occupations in the State. This means that the buying power and taxable income will be low. Thus, the merchants will not be able to sell much and the State and local governments will not receive much revenue. The harm in this case can probably be best measured in terms of the number of people affected.

Medium close-up

Even after you have checked your original list of problems to see how many actually result in substantial harm, you may still find that your list is a long one. Perhaps not all these problems can be blamed on the present policy. So, your next step is to determine

---

SCRIPT

---

to what extent, if any, the present system is actually to blame for these conditions. In other words, "Does the present policy actually cause these problems?"

Visual aid #5

For example, even if you were able to say that the membership in Kansas labor unions has declined since the passage of the Kansas right-to-work law, can you safely say that the right-to-work law actually caused people to stop joining unions? Perhaps the unions were ineffective in their membership campaigns, or perhaps the number of union-represented jobs greatly declined.

Medium long shot

On the other hand, even if you were able to say for sure that the right-to-work law caused people to stop joining unions, does this condition actually generate any economic ills. Perhaps wages have



---

**SCRIPT**

---

actually increased since right-to-work became effective even though union membership dropped. Or, even if economic conditions are bad, this doesn't necessarily mean that right-to-work laws are to blame. Perhaps a general condition of depression or recession has prevailed which might cause unhealthy economic situations regardless of how many people belonged to unions. So, you must determine if the present system actually causes the problems.

Walk to easel

Now, assuming that your analysis has revealed that problems exist, that they are serious, and that they are actually caused by the present system, your final stage of questioning concerning the need issue involves determining whether or not a fundamental change of policy is required to solve the situation.

---

SCRIPT

---

Medium close-up

Visual aid #6

In other words, you must ask yourself, "Can these problems be solved by the present system?" Must the situation be remedied by changing the entire present system or could it be solved by a revision in the present policy?

This is a vital step in the analysis of the need issue because it deals with inherency, or the fundamental capability of the present system to overcome the existing problems.

In the proposition,  
Resolved: "That the Kansas right-to-work law should be repealed," an inherent reason to change the policy would be a situation in which the problems could not be overcome as long as the fundamental feature of the present policy existed. In this case, the

---

SCRIPT

---

fundamental feature would be that no one is required to join a union in order to get or keep a job. Perhaps a revision in this policy could solve whatever problems exist. It might be that by extending the right-to-work principle only to those who work in jobs where more than fifty-percent of the employees belong to the union voluntarily, the fundamental feature of the present system could be retained in some form but union membership would grow enough to overcome the economic problems. Thus, in this case, a fundamental change may not be necessary.

Close-up

Exclude visual aid #6

It should be kept clearly in mind that the use of stock issues concerning the need for a change can be used in preparation for the negative as well as for the affirmative. The negative debater also

---

SCRIPT

---

needs to know whether or not problems exist, whether or not these problems result in substantial harm, whether or not it is the present policy which actually causes these problems, and whether or not these problems could be overcome within the scope of the present system.

Medium close-up

Visual aid #1

This then will be your approach to the stock issue called the need issue. Obviously, your analysis will not stop here. It is not enough for purposes of debate to simply say that the present system is unsatisfactory. You, as a debater, must determine whether or not the proposed policy will overcome these problems. In other words, you must know if the proposed plan will meet the alleged needs.

---

SCRIPT

---

Change placards

"Will the proposal remedy the problems inherent in the present policy?" This is the most general question pertaining to the stock issue concerning the plan.

Visual aid #7

Whether the proposed change takes the form of a general statement of policy or a detailed plan of action, it must clearly solve the needs. In order to determine the effectiveness of the course of action, you can ask yourself two more specific questions. The first question is, "Will the plan be workable?" If it can be put into operation, you next need to ask, "Will the plan be effective?"

Visual aid #8

Certainly, one of the major requirements of a plan is that it could--not necessarily that it would--be workable enough to be put into operation.

Some conditions which might prevent the plan being put into

---

SCRIPT

---

action are: prohibitive cost, administrative red-tape, or no means of enforcement. Let's return to our example of the Kansas right-to-work law. Perhaps there are many persons in the Kansas labor force who are opposed to joining a union. If the right-to-work law were repealed and they could be required to join a union, they would probably refuse to work. Thus the change would be unenforceable. Because it is unenforceable, it couldn't actually operate, and thus could not meet the needs.

Even if the plan is workable, that doesn't mean that it will necessarily solve the problems. You need to examine the plan further to see if it would be effective.

Close-up. Walk to  
table and sit.

---

SCRIPT

---

One way a plan can be effective is if it removes the causes of the problems which were revealed in the examination of the need issue. If all the economic ills were caused by the fact that the right-to-work laws weakened unions, then removing the right-to-work policy should have as its effect the strengthening of unions. This would, in turn, improve the general economic condition in Kansas. Thus, by removing the causes of the problem the plan would be effective.

However, a plan does not always have to remove the cause of a problem to be effective. Sometimes it is enough to just relieve the seriousness or harmful effect of the problem. Let's suppose you had discovered that the unhealthy economic conditions in Kansas were caused by a general state of

---

SCRIPT

---

recession, not by right-to-work legislation. Even if this were true, you might also find that by repealing the right-to-work law and requiring people to join a union, wages throughout the State would get better, people could buy more, more money could be put into circulation, and the economic state would improve. Thus, even though the plan does not directly remove the cause of the problems, it does tend to work against them. By relieving the seriousness or harmful effect of the problems, the plan would be effective.

Again, you should remember that these questions concerning the "plan" stock issue are just as useful to the debater whether he is preparing for the affirmative or negative. Debaters on both sides of the question need to know whether the plan can be put into



---

SCRIPT

---

operation and if it would be effective.

Medium close-up

Up to this point, we have been concerned with locating problems which may exist in the present system and the ability of the proposed policy to work toward solving these problems. You will find, however, that in most debate situations the proposed change will do more than just work in the area of the needs. Most new policies will produce side effects. These side effects may be good or bad but in either case they should be examined by using the stock issue called "advantages."

Rise and walk to  
easel

Visual aid #1

Change placards

Visual aid #9

"Do the good side effects outweigh the bad side effects?" This is the most important question to ask yourself in examining the advantages issue.

---

SCRIPT

---

Our first job is to be sure we understand what side effects are. Very simply, side effects are these conditions created by the new policy which have no direct connection with the problems discovered in the need analysis.

In order to determine whether the good side effects outweigh the bad we must first determine all the side effects the plan will produce. For example, the repeal of the Kansas right-to-work law might create many conditions. If people have to join a union in order to keep a job, this may cause the unions to become corrupt since they would no longer have to be fair to the working man in order to gain membership. So, corrupt unions may be one side effect. If the repeal of the right-to-work law actually did cause wages to rise, new industries

---

SCRIPT

---

may not want to come to Kansas, because they would also have to pay these high wages in order to get employees. Discouraging new industry may be another side effect. On the other hand, if a person must belong to a union in order to hold his job, he must have the necessary skills in order to get into the union in the first place. Thus, the repeal of the right-to-work law might insure that we would always have qualified workers in skilled positions. A third side effect may be the guarantee of skilled workers. In this situation we have seen both good and bad side effects. In most debate questions, the side effects will be both good and bad. It is your job as a debater to determine whether the good ones or the bad ones are more important. The important thing right now is

---

SCRIPT

---

that you know side effects will occur.

Close-up

These then, are the questions you could ask yourself in analysing a debate proposition. Remember in the "need" portion, your most general consideration was, "Is there sufficient reason to make a fundamental departure from the present policy?" In order to determine this, you need to ask yourself four more specific questions: (1) Do problems actually exist? (2) Do the problems result in substantial harm? (3) Are these problems actually caused by the present policy? (4) Can these problems be overcome within the scope of the present system? When considering the "plan" portion the most basic question is "Will the proposed change remedy the problems inherent in the present policy?"

---

SCRIPT

---

This can be revealed by asking the two specific questions: (1) Can the plan be put into operation; (2) Will the plan be effective? Then when you're considering the "advantages" stock issue the important question is, "Do the good side effects outweigh the bad side effects?"

Long shot

The use of these stock issues can lead you to the real issues of a debate proposition and may lead you to accurate and orderly analysis.

Close-up

By understanding the three traditional stock issues concerning the need, plan, and advantages which can be applied to almost any debate question, your initial job of analysis will be much easier.

## **APPENDIX C**

## APPENDIX C

### EVALUATION SHEET

Your estimation of the film's utility to beginning high school debaters is desired. Please rate the film's effectiveness in each of the categories listed below. Use a 15-point rating scale with "1" being the lowest rating and "15" the highest rating.

#### EVALUATION OF MESSAGE

1. Accuracy of material \_\_\_\_\_
2. Thoroughness of material \_\_\_\_\_
3. Organization of material \_\_\_\_\_
4. Interest of material \_\_\_\_\_
5. Use of examples \_\_\_\_\_
6. Clarity of material \_\_\_\_\_
7. Utility of material \_\_\_\_\_
8. Choice of language \_\_\_\_\_
9. Use of visual aids \_\_\_\_\_
10. Communicability of lecturer \_\_\_\_\_
11. General effectiveness of the material \_\_\_\_\_

#### EVALUATION OF MEDIUM

1. Quality of sound \_\_\_\_\_
2. Absence of distracting elements \_\_\_\_\_

3. Planning of shot sequences \_\_\_\_\_
4. Quality of settings \_\_\_\_\_
5. Quality of lighting \_\_\_\_\_
6. Camera emphasis of important visual  
elements \_\_\_\_\_
7. General effectiveness of use of medium \_\_\_\_\_