

A SURVEY OF HIGH SCHOOL DEBATE IN KANSAS
FOR THE YEAR 1960-1961

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

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

by
David James Blackim
August 1961

Thesis
1961
B

Approved for the Major Department

Richard A. Kilbuck

Approved for the Graduate Council

Jurman L. Brylan

9

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Origin of the Problem	1
Purpose	1
The Problem	2
Approach	2
Limitations	3
II. METHODS, PROCEDURES, AND TECHNIQUES	4
Method	4
Procedures	4
Technique	4
III. PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA	7
What was the level of preparation and experience attained by the debate coaches of Kansas	8
What responsibilities does the debate coach assume	17
What special considerations are given the debate coach	19
What status does the debate program hold in regard to the curriculum	22
What teaching aids are used by the coach of debate	31

CHAPTER

What was the source, size, and use of debate funds in the schools in Kansas	35
What is the status of contest debating in Kansas	48
How do Kansas debate coaches evaluate state certification requirements for coaching debate	49
What limitations existed in the debate programs of Kansas	51
IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	55
Conclusions	55
Preparation and experience	55
Responsibilities of the coach	56
Special considerations given the debate coach	56
Status in regard to curriculum	56
Teaching aids	57
Debate budget source, size, and expenditure	57
Status of contest debating in Kansas	59
Limitations	59
Additional conclusions	59

CHAPTER	PAGE
Recommendations	60
BIBLIOGRAPHY	62
APPENDIX A. Questionnaire on the Status of	
Debate in Kansas High Schools	64
APPENDIX B. Summary of Questionnaire	68

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I. College Speech and Debate Training, 1952 . . .	9
II. College Speech and Debate Training, 1961 . . .	9
III. College Speech and Debate Training, In-State Institutions	12
IV. College Speech and Debate Training, Out-of-State Institutions	13
V. Number of Years Experience in Coaching Debate, 1952	15
VI. Number of Years Experience in Coaching Debate, 1961	16
VII. Activities for Which the Coach is Responsible, Debate Tournaments	17
VIII. Activities for Which the Coach is Responsible, Speech Festivals	18
IX. Extra Salary Paid the Debate Coach, 1952 . . .	19
X. Extra Salary Paid the Debate Coach, 1961 . . .	20
XI. Number of Semester Credits Possible, 1952 . .	22
XII. Number of Semester Credits Possible, 1961 . .	23
XIII. Debate Program Size, 1952	24
XIV. Debate Program Size, 1961	25
XV. Tournaments Attended by Respective Schools, 1952	26

TABLE	PAGE
XVI. Tournaments Attended by Respective Schools, 1961	27
XVII. Tournaments Attended by the Individual Student, 1952	28
XVIII. Tournaments Attended by the Individual Student, 1961	28
XIX. Program Existence, 1952	30
XX. Program Existence, 1961	30
XXI. Schools Using Debate Text, 1952	32
XXII. Schools Using Debate Text, 1961	32
XXIII. Use of Commercial Handbooks, 1961	33
XXIV. Schools Making Use of Recording Devices, 1952	34
XXV. Recording Devices Specifically for Debate Programs, 1961	34
XXVI. Source of Debate Budget, 1952	36
XXVII. Source of Debate Budget, 1961	36
XXVIII. Size of Debate Budget, 1952	38
XXIX. Size of Debate Budget, 1961	39
XXX. Expenditures for Students Meals, 1952	40
XXXI. Expenditures for Students Meals, 1961	41
XXXII. Expenditures for Coaches Meals, 1961	42
XXXIII. Expenditures for Sponsors Meals, 1961	42

TABLE	PAGE
XXXIV. Expenditure for Use of Private Car, 1952 . .	44
XXXV. Expenditure for Use of Private Car, 1961 . .	44
XXXVI. Expenditures for Use of School Cars, 1961 .	46
XXXVII. Expenditures for Lodging, 1952	47
XXXVIII. Expenditures for Lodging, 1961	47
XXXIX. Increased Financial Remuneration for Coaching, 1961	49
XL. Certification of Debate Coaches, 1961 . . .	50
XLI. Coaches Evaluation of Program Adequacy, 1961	51
XLII. Limitations of the Program, 1952	53
XLIII. Limitations of the Program, 1961	53

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Origin of the Problem. It was noted in 1956 that with the exception of a study done by John Kelso in 1951-1952¹, little or no research in this field existed. Since the Kelso study, which will serve as the pilot study, minor studies in 1956-1957² and 1959-1960³ have been completed. In the case of the two minor studies only charts of statistical data were prepared and no analysis or conclusions were attempted.

Purpose. The purpose of this survey was an investigation of as many specific factors as are involved in financing the Kansas high school debate program as could be defined. These factors are enumerated in the statement of the Problem.

¹John E. Kelso, An Evaluation of High School Debate in Kansas for the year 1951-1952 (unpublished Master's Thesis, Kansas State Teachers College, Emporia, 1952).

²David J. Blackim, A Statistical Report of the Financial Status of Debate in the State of Kansas 1956-1957 (unpublished individual report, Kansas State Teachers College, Emporia, 1957).

³David J. Blackim, A Statistical Report of the Debate Programs in the State of Kansas 1959-1960 (unpublished individual report, Russell High School, Russell, Kansas, 1960).

The Problem. The general problem appeared to be a lack of available data regarding the status of Kansas high school debate programs.

The basic problem was subdivided into the following nine questions.

1. What was the level of preparation and experience attained by the debate coaches of Kansas?
2. What responsibilities does the debate coach assume?
3. What special considerations are given to the debate coach?
4. What status does the debate program hold in regard to the curriculum?
5. What teaching aids are used by the coach of debate?
6. What was the source, size, and use of debate funds in the schools of Kansas?
7. What was the status of contest debating in Kansas?
8. How did Kansas debate coaches evaluate state certification requirements for debate coaching?
9. What limitations existed in the debate program of Kansas?

Approach. The study was approached from three general areas:

1. The financial increment paid for the coaching of debate and its possible effect upon increasing the number of qualified teachers of debate.

2. The present means of obtaining funds for use in administering Kansas high school debate programs in relation to the needs shown by the study.

3. A compilation of data useful to coaches and administrators in determining the present status of debate and planning for the future of Kansas debate programs.

Limitations. An investigation of the data indicated that possible limitations should be noted.

First, it was apparent that the original thesis and the 1960-1961 data could not be compared with one hundred per cent accuracy due to the selectivity used in the 1951-1952 study. Second, a factor that had to be considered when comparing this study and the Kelso study was the changes that have come about since the Kelso study. Size of enrollment, cost of living, changes in state regulation, etc., all affected, to a degree, the comparison of the two collections of data.

CHAPTER II

METHODS, PROCEDURES, AND TECHNIQUES

Method. Due to the scope of the study and the desired collection of data the survey technique was employed. By the use of this method an over-all view of Kansas debate programs was possible. Also, extraction of specific segments of data for examination was possible. It was further believed that this method insured greater latitude when comparing the 1960-1961 data with that collected by Kelso. This method, it was felt, would more clearly indicate to what degree the Kansas debate program has changed.

Procedures. To determine the status of Kansas high school debate programs a questionnaire was sent to all Kansas high school debate coaches whose schools were registered with the Kansas State High School Activities Association. The questionnaire was distributed at the end of the 1960-1961 debate season.

Technique. The questionnaire was closely patterned after that prepared by Kelso for the 1951-1952 study. Only in those areas where items did not apply or where a greater latitude of reply was desired were alterations made in the original questionnaire.

Specifically these changes allowed for the collection of the following data: (1) institutions from which debate coaches had received their degrees, (2) cost of using a school owned means of transportation and its seating capacity, (3) coaches evaluation of state certification requirements, (4) coaches opinion regarding the effect of higher salaries to increase the number of trained debate coaches. Some questions found in the 1952 study were omitted from the 1961 survey since they did not investigate the purpose of the later study.

Once the amended instrument was completed, it was submitted to thirty members of the staff of Kansas State Teachers College, Emporia. On the basis of their evaluations and suggestions the final form for this survey was formulated.

Data collected by the returned questionnaires was tabulated and the arithmetic mean was computed as advocated by Ross and Stanley.¹ The computed means served as a basis for calculation of percentages which were in turn compared, where possible, to secure answers to the questions studied.

¹C. C. Ross and Julian C. Stanley, Measurement in Today's Schools (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall Inc., 1954), p. 81.

All extreme variations which could diminish the validity of the mean were noted. All fractions have been expressed to two decimals after rounding off from three places.

In the Kolbe study,

Next group chosen is:

CHAPTER III

PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

The status of the debate program in Kansas for 1960-1961 was determined by the use of a questionnaire which was sent to coaches of all high schools registered with the Kansas State High School Activities Association. Of the ninety-two questionnaires distributed, fifty-four satisfactory replies were received. A copy of the questionnaire is found in Appendix A with a chart summary of results reported in Appendix B.

Unlike the Kelso study, which received thirty-six of forty-two replies, a select group chosen at random was not used in the collection of data. Of the ninety-two questionnaires distributed, fifty-four were returned. This 58.70 per cent return compares with the 86 per cent return of the original study. The 27.30 per cent difference was largely due to the selectivity factor involved in the original study.

As was the case in the original study, this survey classified schools AA, A, and B. This procedure is that adopted by the Kansas High School Activities Association.

For participation in district and state debate tournaments, all schools shall be divided into three classes, AA, A, and B. Schools with enrollments of more than 475 shall be in class AA;

those whose enrollments are more than 150 and not more than 475 shall be in class A; and schools whose enrollments are 150 or less, shall be in class B. However, any school may elect to go into a class composed of higher enrollments but may not elect to enter a class of schools with smaller enrollments.¹

WHAT WAS THE LEVEL OF PREPARATION AND EXPERIENCE ATTAINED BY THE DEBATE COACHES OF KANSAS?

To secure the answer to the above question propounded as a basic portion of the study, eight questions were developed and included in the questionnaire. An examination of the data collected by these questions will be presented question-by-question and analyzed in terms of the major problem stated above.

What is the total number of college credits you have in Speech; Discussion; Debate and Public Speaking; other areas of Speech? Table I presents a tabulation of the responses to this question divided by school classification, number of hours of training, and a comparison between the 1952 and 1961 studies.

It should be noted that comparison of the results of the 1952 and 1961 survey indicated great improvement in the area of preparation for coaching debate.

¹E. A. Thomas, Commissioner; Carl H. Kopelk, Wanda May Vinson, Assistants to the Commissioner, The Kansas State High School Activities Association, Official Handbook, 1951-1952 (Topeka, Kansas: Association Headquarters), p. 29.

TABLE I
COLLEGE SPEECH AND DEBATE TRAINING
1952

Hours	High School Classification						Totals	%
	AA	%	A	%	B	%		
0	1	6.25					1	2.86
1-10	4	25.00	3	33.33	1	10.00	8	22.86
11-20	3	18.75	4	44.44	7	70.00	14	40.00
21-30	5	31.25	2	22.22	1	10.00	8	22.86
31-40	1	6.25			1	10.00	2	5.74
41+	2	12.50					2	5.74
Totals	16		9		10		35	

College hours, as the result of

and by 1961 debate training

TABLE II
COLLEGE SPEECH AND DEBATE TRAINING
1961

Hours	High School Classification						Totals	%
	AA	%	A	%	B	%		
0								
1-10	4	18.18	2	10.00	2	25.00	8	16.00
11-20	6	27.27	3	15.00	2	25.00	11	22.00
21-30	3	13.64	7	35.00	1	12.50	11	22.00
31-40	4	18.18	5	25.00	1	12.50	10	20.00
41	5	22.78	3	15.00	2	25.00	10	20.00
Totals	22		20		8		50	

Of thirty-six reporting coaches in 1952, there was a total of 666 hours of college speech work reported. This produced a mean of 18.50 hours of speech work per coach. The results of the 1961 survey revealed that fifty-four coaches had acquired 1740.50 college speech hours for a mean of 32.23 hours of speech courses. On the basis of these figures a 13.73 hour increase over the original study was indicated. Even though extremes in number of hours taken prevail in both studies, they were not of great enough magnitude to greatly affect the over-all increase. On the average, the coach of 1952 was not as fully prepared, in terms of college hours, as the coach of 1961. It was significant to note that by 1961 debate coaches had, on the average, enough college hours to constitute a speech major. The 1952 average was a fraction more than half the 1961 figure.

It was noted that not all recorded hours were related to the specific field of argumentation and debate; however, the coaches of 1961 did have more college speech training than the coaches of 1952. This was indicated by an analysis of the data that disclosed in 1952, 31.25 per cent of AA coaches had ten hours or less; in class A 33.33 per cent had ten hours or less; and only 10 per cent of class B coaches had ten hours or less.

By contrast, in 1961, 18.18 per cent of the AA coaches held ten hours or less; 10 per cent of class A coaches and 25 per cent of class B coaches still had acquired ten hours or less.

Assuming that thirty semester hours was the basic minimum for proper preparation as a teacher of debate, it was disclosed that the number of class AA coaches in this category increased by 29.25 per cent. In class A the increase was 40 per cent. It was in the class A grouping that Kelso's study showed a higher per cent of coaches with ten hours or less. The 1961 study showed class A to have made the greatest improvement in preparation. Class B coaches, in the thirty hours or above group, increased by 28 per cent, or about the same as class AA. It was noted in the 1952 survey that in terms of percentage, class AA and A coaches tended to be more equally prepared. With the class A increasing 40 per cent since 1952, as opposed to class AA and B increases of 29.25 per cent and 28 per cent respectively, it appeared that coaches in all classes are now more equally prepared than in 1952.

What degrees do you hold, and from what institutions were they granted? In acquiring speech hours Kansas coaches attended a wide range of institutions and received a variety of degrees.

TABLE III

COLLEGE SPEECH AND DEBATE TRAINING
IN-STATE INSTITUTIONS, 1961

Schools	High School Classification						Totals		Percentages	
	AA	B*	M**	A	M	B	B	M	B	M
Kansas University	1			1			1	1	2.78	16.67
Kansas State University						1	1	1	2.78	
K.S.T.C., Emporia	2		2		1		7	2	19.44	33.33
Ft. Hays State College	3	1	1				4	2	11.11	33.33
K.S.C., Pittsburg	4	1			1		5	1	13.89	16.67
Sterling College			2				2		5.56	
Baker University	1						1	1	2.78	
Southwestern	1						1	2	5.56	
McPherson College	1						3	3	8.33	
Bethel College	1					1	3	3	8.33	
Ottawa University						1	2	2	5.56	
Wichita University	3					1	4	1	11.11	
St. Marys, Xavier, Ks.	1						1	1	2.78	
Totals	18	2	13	3	5	1	36	6	100.00	100.00

*Bachelors Degree

**Masters Degree

TABLE IV

COLLEGE SPEECH AND DEBATE TRAINING
OUT-OF-STATE INSTITUTIONS, 1961

Schools	High School Classification						Totals		Percentages	
	B*	M**	B	A	B	M	B	M	B	M
Michigan University	1						1		5.56	9.09
Central Mo. State	1						1		5.56	18.19
Iowa University	2		1				3		16.68	
William Jewell	1						1		5.56	9.09
Missouri University	1						1		5.56	9.09
T. C. U.	1						1		5.56	9.09
Colorado State	1						1		5.56	9.09
Nebraska University	1						1		5.56	9.09
Park College	1						1		5.56	9.09
U. of Southern Calif.					1			1		9.09
Denver University					1			1		9.09
N.W. St. Teachers, Alva			1				1		5.56	9.09
Central State, Enid			1				1		5.56	9.09
Panhandle A.M., Goodwell			1				1		5.56	9.09
Oklahoma University			1			1	2	1	11.12	9.09
Colorado University					1		1		5.56	9.09
George Pepperdine	1						1		5.56	9.09
Oklahoma State U.						1	1		5.56	9.09
N. W. State, Talequeh			1				2		11.12	9.09
Phillips University			1				1		5.56	9.09
Kansas City University							1		5.56	9.09
Totals	8	5	7	5	3	1	18	11	100.00	100.00

*Bachelors Degree
**Masters Degree

The original study done by Kelso did not investigate this area; however, it was included in the 1961 survey to broaden its scope and obtain a better understanding of the coaches in Kansas. The Kansas coaches collectively received a total of seventy-one degrees, excluding all degrees below the Bachelor level. Seventeen coaches held masters degrees. None had a degree higher than a masters degree.

The schools most often selected for advanced work were Kansas State Teachers College, Emporia, and Kansas State College, Pittsburg. Each school had two masters graduates coaching in Kansas. The leading out-of-state school was State University of Iowa, also with two masters graduates.

Selection of schools for undergraduate work also disclosed Kansas State Teachers College, Emporia, as the leader with seven graduates in Kansas coaching ranks. Kansas State College, Pittsburg, was next with five graduates. The primary out-of-state school was William Jewell College, Liberty, Missouri, with two graduates. The fifty-four replies revealed that of all out-of-state schools represented by Kansas coaches, Oklahoma colleges were the most frequently represented.

Final analysis indicated that Kansas' coaching staff is primarily made up of Kansas educated teachers.

Forty-two of seventy degrees, or 60 per cent, were granted by Kansas colleges or universities.

How much experience have you had in the debate coaching field? If experience in the coaching field is any indication of program stability, it was obvious that in 1961 the situation left a great deal to be desired. In 1952 the reporting coaches had on the average of 6.69 years of experience, while the 1961 coach produced an average of 5.02 years of experience or a decrease of 1.67 years. Tables V and VI compare the over-all state position for the years 1952 and 1961.

TABLE V
NUMBER OF YEARS EXPERIENCE IN COACHING DEBATE
1952

Years of coaching experience	High School Classification						Totals	%
	AA	%	A	%	B	%		
0- 1	5	31.25	2	20.00	4	40.00	11	30.55
2- 5	4	25.00	3	30.00	5	50.00	12	33.33
6-10	3	18.75	5	50.00			8	22.22
11-15	1	6.25			1	10.00	2	5.55
16-20	2	12.50					2	5.55
21-25	1	6.25					1	2.77
26+								
Totals	16		10		10		36	

TABLE VI
NUMBER OF YEARS EXPERIENCE IN COACHING DEBATE
1961

Years of coaching experience	High School Classification						Totals	%
	AA	%	A	%	B	%		
0- 1	5	19.23	6	30.00	3	37.50	14	25.92
2- 5	15	57.69	9	45.00	3	37.50	27	50.00
6-10	3	11.53	3	15.00	1	12.50	7	12.96
11-15	1	3.85	1	5.00			2	3.71
16-20	1	3.85					1	1.85
21-25			1	5.00	1	12.50	2	3.71
26+	1	3.85					1	1.85
Totals	26		20		8		54	

When each class was studied individually, it was discovered that class AA coaches, on the average, had 5.28 years of experience; class A coaches had coached on the average for 4.45 years; and class B coaches had accrued an average of 5.25 years. The 5.25 years average is not as significant as it may seem however, since only eight schools replied and one of the eight coaches had twenty-three years experience. Excluding this extreme, the class B average was only 2.71 years. No such extremes affected the class AA or A results.

Only brief consideration was given to the change in teaching load of coaches. The teaching load of the thirty-four coaches responding to the 1952 study was reduced by

a total of only eight hours. This constituted an average of only .22 hours reduction per coach. The practice of reducing teaching load of coaches was of even lesser significance in the 1961 survey. The average load reduction of 1961 coaches was a mere .07 hours per coach. This trend possibly indicates administrative philosophy or a greater demand for teachers created by increased enrollments.

WHAT RESPONSIBILITIES DOES THE DEBATE COACH ASSUME?

Are you responsible for hosting an invitational debate tournament? Table VII shows that twenty-five of the fifty-four surveyed schools held tournaments. In 1952 fifteen of thirty-six schools were host to an invitational debate tournament for an average of 44.11 per cent. Although this comparison indicated an increase of 1.85 per cent, the data may be misleading due to the differing numbers of schools encompassed by the two studies.

TABLE VII

ACTIVITIES FOR WHICH THE COACH IS RESPONSIBLE
DEBATE TOURNAMENTS

Year	High School Classification						Totals	%
	AA	%	A	%	B	%		
1952	9	34.61	5	50.00	1	10.00	15	44.11
1961	17	31.48	8	40.00			25	44.44
Totals	26		13		1		40	

Are you responsible for second semester speech activities sponsored by the K.S.H.S.A.A.? Many debate coaches had assignments, in addition to debate responsibilities, of coaching second semester festival events. The insertion of this item in the questionnaire was not an attempt to justify or condemn the assignment, but an attempt to ascertain to what degree the various speech activities, in the schools who were members of the Kansas State High School Activities Association, were coached by the same teachers.

TABLE VIII
ACTIVITIES FOR WHICH THE COACH IS RESPONSIBLE
SPEECH FESTIVALS

Year	High School Classification						Totals	%
	AA	%	A	%	B	%		
1952	13	81.25	7	70.00	7	70.00	27	75.00
1961	<u>19</u>	73.08	<u>17</u>	85.00	<u>8</u>	100.00	<u>44</u>	81.48
Totals	32		24		15		71	

A comparison of the data collected by Kelso in 1952 disclosed that twenty-seven of the thirty-six coaches, or 75 per cent, had charge of both debate and other forensic activities. In 1961, forty-four of the fifty-four coaches, or 81.48 per cent held responsibilities in both areas.

This increase of 6.48 per cent increase was possibly the influence of the larger sampling, but also could be due to the improved preparation in speech attained by coaches of 1961 as opposed to those in 1952.

WHAT SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS ARE GIVEN
THE DEBATE COACH?

What extra salary do you receive above the schedule for the coaching of debate? Due to the nature of services performed, Kansas debate coaches receive compensations not usually accorded the general classroom teacher. These compensations were: (1) additional salary, and (2) reduced teaching load, and were found to be widely varied in all classes.

TABLE IX

EXTRA SALARY PAID THE DEBATE COACH
1952

Yearly Amt. of extra salary	High School Classification		A		B		Totals	%
	AA	%		%		%		
\$ 0	9	56.25	7	70.00	7	70.00	23	63.88
50							0	
100	2	12.50	1	10.00			3	8.33
125	1	6.25					1	5.55
150							0	
200	2	12.50	1	10.00			3	8.33
250							0	
300	1	6.25			3	30.00	4	11.11
500	1*	6.25	1	10.00			2	5.55
Totals	16		10		10		36	

*One class AA school pays a teacher in the system \$500 yearly to teach debate until the regular coach is released from the army.

TABLE X
EXTRA SALARY PAID THE DEBATE COACH
1961

Yearly Amt. of extra salary	High School Classification						Totals	%
	AA	%	A	%	B	%		
\$ 0	4	15.38	9	45.00	5	62.50	18	33.33
50			2	10.00			2	3.70
100	1	3.84	3	15.00	1	12.50	5	9.25
125	1	3.84					1	1.85
150	2	7.69					2	3.70
175			1	5.00			1	1.85
200	6	23.07	4	20.00	1	12.50	11	20.73
250	2	7.69					2	3.70
300	5	19.23					5	9.25
350			1	5.00			1	1.85
400	1	3.84					1	1.85
500					1	12.50	1	1.85
600	3	11.53					3	5.55
750	1*	3.84					1	1.85
Totals	26		20		8		54	

*Also coached junior college.

Examination of the 1952 study indicated an over-all average of \$89.50 being paid Kansas coaches for their extra duties. Due to the relatively large number of schools that paid nothing extra for coaching, this figure was not entirely accurate. Fourteen of the schools, constituting 38.89 per cent, paid no extra salary for coaching. Omitting those examples where no extra salary was given for coaching duties, the average additional salary paid to the coaches of 1952 was \$248.08. Only class A fell below the over-all

average of \$89.50. As might have been expected, class AA was the class that paid the highest additional salaries. The class AA schools on the average were paying \$5.81 above the over-all average. Class B schools were fifty cents above the state average and class A schools were \$9.50 below the state average.

The 1961 data revealed that the over-all average for all classes was \$248.65, or an increase of only fifty-seven cents. However, if those eighteen schools that paid nothing extra for coaching debate, constituting 33.33 per cent of the total, were omitted the state average rose to \$270.37. This corrected figure is \$80.87 above the 1952 figure. As was true in 1952, class AA coaches were receiving the most additional pay for coaching, and class A coaches were receiving the least. Class AA schools in 1961 were paying \$86.36 above the state average; class A schools were \$84.12 below the state average; and class B schools were \$70.37 below the over-all state average. These figures were derived from the use of the corrected state average.

How many hours of teaching are reduced from your teaching assignment because of coaching debate? Examination of factors concerned with reduction of teaching load for coaching debate revealed that in 1952 thirty-six coaches were granted a total of eight extra free hours

due to their coaching duties. This policy appeared to be almost non-existent in 1961 when fifty-four coaches reported a reduction of only four hours among them.

WHAT STATUS DOES THE DEBATE PROGRAM HOLD
IN REGARD TO THE CURRICULUM?

In your school is the debate program curricular or extra-curricular? The status of the debate program as a part of the school curriculum was found to be variable in both 1952 and 1961. With this fact established, it followed that schools would accord a great variation of high school credit for participation in the schools debate.

2.13 in both 1952 and 1961. The number of schools ranged from no credit to a total of 61

TABLE XI High school credits in 1961

NUMBER OF SEMESTER CREDITS POSSIBLE
1952

Classification	Debate Credits								
	0	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	1	2	3	4	5	6
AA	1	1		2	5	4	2		1
A	4		1		1		2		2
B	2			4	1		3		
Totals	7	1	1	6	7	4	7	0	3

TABLE XII
 NUMBER OF SEMESTER CREDITS POSSIBLE
 1961

Classification	Debate Credits									
	0	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	1	$1\frac{1}{2}$	2	3	4	5	6
AA	2		1	4	4	4	9	1		1
A	5	1	1	1	1	4	4	3		
B			1	1	2	1	2			1*
Totals	7	1	3	6	7	9	15	4	0	2

*One school reported 8 credits.

The average number of credits given for curricular debate was 2.13 in both 1952 and 1961. The extremes in this area in 1952 ranged from no credit to a total of six credits, and from no credits to eight credits in 1961.

In 1952, 11 per cent of the thirty-six schools offered debate both as a curricular activity and as an extra-curricular activity. The 1961 statistics indicated that this has risen only 7.52 per cent. The greatest number of schools offering the dual program were to be found in class B where 75 per cent of the reporting schools offered the program either within, or outside, the curriculum. School size undoubtedly was the cause of this practice since class AA and A schools made use of this arrangement in only 19.23 per cent and 15 per cent of their respective classifications.

Data for 1961 disclosed that 31.58 per cent of all surveyed schools offered debate only as an extra-curricular activity; 55.55 per cent offered debate only as a curricular activity; and the remaining 12.87 per cent offered debate both curricular and extra-curricular.

What is the average size of your debate squad? In the nine years since the original study a great increase came about in terms of the number of students participating in competitive debate in Kansas high schools.

TABLE XIII

DEBATE PROGRAM SIZE
1952

Pupils participating	High School Classification						Totals	%
	AA	%	A	%	B	%		
4-8	2	12.50	1	10.00	4	40.00	7	19.44
9-12	6	37.50	3	30.00	4	40.00	13	36.11
13-16	4	25.00	3	30.00	1	10.00	8	22.21
17-20	3	18.75	3	30.00	1	10.00	7	19.44
21+	1	6.25					1	2.77
Totals	16		10		10		36	

TABLE XIV
DEBATE PROGRAM SIZE
1961

Pupils participating	High School Classification						Totals	%
	AA	%	A	%	B	%		
1- 5			1	5.00			1	1.85
6-10	4	15.38	10	50.00	4	50.00	18	33.33
11-20	9	34.61	9	45.00	4	50.00	22	40.74
21-30	8	30.76					8	14.81
31-40	3	11.53					3	5.55
41-60							0	0.00
61-80	1	3.84					1	1.85
81-100	1	3.84					1	1.85
Totals	26		20		8		54	

The study by Kelso indicated that the average size of the debate programs surveyed in 1952 was 12.19 students. In 1961 this figure had risen to an average of 17.96 students. The average increase of 5.87 debaters per program did not appear to be the most significant factor.

In class AA competition, average program size rose from 13 students in 1952 to 25.57 students in 1961, an average increase of 12.57 participants per school. In class A there appeared to be a slight decrease from 12.50 students in 1952 to 10.40 students in 1961. A slight reduction also occurred in class B where the decline of squad size was a mere .15 student. The 1952 average was 10.40 students and the 1961 average was 10.25 students.

Comparison of all figures indicated that the 17.96 average was a result of the influence of the large AA schools.

How many debate tournaments does your school attend per year? To determine the number of debate tournaments each school attended during the 1961 season, the surveyed schools were asked to state the average number of tournaments attended by their respective school.

TABLE XV
TOURNAMENTS ATTENDED BY RESPECTIVE SCHOOLS
1952

Number of AA tournaments	High School Classification						Totals	%
	AA	%	A	%	B	%		
0					1	10.00	1	2.77
1					1	10.00	1	2.77
2					2	20.00	2	5.55
4			2	20.00	1	10.00	3	8.33
5	6	37.50	4	40.00	2	20.00	12	33.33
6	3	18.75	2	20.00	2	20.00	7	19.44
7	3	18.75	1	10.00			4	11.11
8					1	10.00	1	2.77
9	2	12.50					2	5.55
10	1	6.25					1	2.77
11	1	6.25	1	10.00			2	5.55
Totals	16		10		10		36	

TABLE XVI
TOURNAMENTS ATTENDED BY RESPECTIVE SCHOOLS
1961

Number of tournaments	High School Classification						Totals	%
	AA*	%	A	%	B	%		
1-5	2	8.00	9	45.00	4	50.00	15	28.31
6-10	10	40.00	10	50.00	2	25.00	22	41.50
11-15	8	32.00	1	5.00	2	25.00	11	20.75
16-20	4	16.00					4	7.54
21-25	1	4.00					1	1.96
Totals	25		20		8		53	

*One Class AA school did not reply

In 1961, fifty-four schools attended an average of 9.33 debate tournaments per school. The 1952 survey disclosed that in that year the thirty-six surveyed schools attended an average of 5.69 tournaments. In other words, the attendance average for respective schools at debate tournaments has increased by 3.64 tournaments.

When analyzed by classes, the influence of class AA schools on the over-all average was apparent. In 1961 class AA schools attended an average of 11.73 tournaments; class A, 7.25 tournaments; and class B, 6.13 tournaments. The 1952 survey disclosed a similar proportional relationship. No attempt was made to distinguish between tournaments that were of one day duration and those that were of two day duration.

How many tournaments, on the average, will your students attend per year? Realizing that the actual debate tournament was the laboratory section of the high school debate program, an attempt was made to determine how much laboratory work students of debate were receiving.

TABLE XVII

TOURNAMENTS ATTENDED BY THE INDIVIDUAL STUDENT
1952

Number of Tournaments	High School Classification						Totals	%
	AA	%	A	%	B	%		
0					1	10.00	1	2.77
1					2	20.00	2	5.55
2					1	10.00	1	2.77
3	2	12.50	4	40.00	1	10.00	7	19.44
4	5	31.25	5	50.00	2	20.00	12	33.33
5	9	56.25	1	10.00	3	30.00	13	36.11
Totals	16		10		10		36	

TABLE XVIII

TOURNAMENTS ATTENDED BY THE INDIVIDUAL STUDENT
1961

Number of tournaments	High School Classification						Totals	%
	AA	%	A	%	B	%		
2					1	12.50	1	1.85
3	6	23.07	3	15.00	1	12.50	10	18.51
4	10	38.46	5	25.00	2	25.00	17	31.48
5	10	38.46	12	60.00	4	50.00	26	48.14
Totals	26		20		8		54	

In Kelso's 1952 study, high school debaters were attending an average of 3.92 tournaments per student. When separated by class, class AA students of debate attended an average of 4.50 tournaments; class A debaters attended an average of 3.70 tournaments; and class B students attended 3.20 tournaments. For matters of comparison it was noted that state regulation limits student participation to not more than five invitational tournaments.²

The results of the 1961 survey indicated an average of 4.24 tournaments, or an increase of .37 tournaments. In class AA the 1961 average was 4.15 tournaments, or a decrease of .35; class A average was 4.50 tournaments or an increase of .80 tournaments; and class B rose from 3.20 tournaments to 4.15 tournaments, for an increase of 1.05 tournaments. This increase was the largest of all three classes.

How many years has your school's debate program been in existence? Believing that the stability of a program was linked with the length of time that the program had been in operation and further believing that the longevity of the program could have a relationship upon its financial backing, an attempt was made to determine the factors relevant to this area.

²Thomas, loc. cit.

TABLE XIX
PROGRAM EXISTENCE
1952

No. of years	High School Classification						Totals	%
	AA	%	A	%	B	%		
1- 3	1	6.25	4	40.00	6	60.00	11	30.56
4- 6	2	12.50	2	20.00	2	20.00	6	13.88
7-12			2	20.00	1	10.00	3	8.33
13-20	4	25.00	1	10.00			5	13.88
21-30	5	33.33	1	10.00	1	10.00	7	19.44
40+	4*	25.00					4	11.11
Totals	16		10		10		36	

*Wendell L. Wilkie, the late statesman, was the first debate coach at Coffeyville, Kansas, high school.

TABLE XX
PROGRAM EXISTENCE
1961

No. of years	High School Classification						Totals	%
	AA*	%	A	%	B**	%		
1- 3	6	26.08	9	45.00	3	42.85	18	36.00
4- 6	4	17.39	4	20.00	2	28.75	10	20.00
7-12	5	21.74	5	25.00	1	14.28	11	22.00
13-20	1	4.34	2	10.00			3	6.00
21-30	4	17.39					4	8.00
31-40+	3	13.04			1	14.28	4	8.00
Totals	23		20		7		50	

*Three did not reply
**One did not reply

In 1952 the surveyed debate programs had been in existence for an average of 13.94 years. Class AA schools had sponsored a debate program for an average of 11.06 years; class A schools had promoted debate on an average of 8.10 years; and class B schools had participated for an average of 5.20 years. It was noted that in class A and class B a few extremes caused the averages to be higher and thus diminish the value of the mean average.

In the more recent study the average years of existence was 9.72 years. Investigation of the data produced the following figures regarding the individual classifications. In class AA the average length of program existence was 12.96 years; class A programs have been in operation for an average of 6.10 years; and class B schools have existed for an average of 7.75 years. As in 1952, extremes caused the averages to be slightly higher and thereby create a misleading mean.

WHAT TEACHING AIDS ARE USED BY
THE COACH OF DEBATE?

Do you make use of debate texts, debate handbooks, or recording devices? Debate coaches have made use of a wide variety of teaching aids to improve the quality of education. Primarily, debate aids were classified into three groups: (1) debate texts, (2) debate handbooks, and (3) recording devices.

1. Debate Texts. Kelso's research disclosed that in 1952, four of the thirty-six surveyed schools made use of a commercial debate text for an average of 11.11 per cent. Two AA schools used this aid while in classes A and B only one school in each classification felt it useful.

Data collected in 1961 disclosed that ten schools of the fifty-four had adopted a basic debate text. This constituted an average of 18.51 per cent. By classification, two class B schools now make use of the text, three class A schools and five class AA schools.

TABLE XXI
SCHOOLS USING DEBATE TEXT
1952

	High School Classification			Totals
	AA	A	B	
No. Schools using text	2	1	1	4

TABLE XXII
SCHOOLS USING DEBATE TEXT
1961

	High School Classification			Totals
	AA	A	B	
No. Schools using text	5	3	2	10

2. Handbooks. The use of handbooks³ in 1952 was not an element of the Kelso study, therefore a comparison was not possible. As a means of determining to what extent these commercial publications were used, data was collected for the 1961 study.

TABLE XXIII
USE OF COMMERCIAL HANDBOOKS
1961

	High School Classification						Totals	%
	AA	%	A	%	B	%		
Number of schools	21	80.76	20	100.00	7	87.51	48	88.89

Of all surveyed schools 88.89 per cent indicated the use of one or more of the available handbooks. All classifications appeared to place great value on the handbook as a necessary teaching tool. In class AA twenty-one or 80.76 per cent of the schools used the publications to some degree. Class A and B schools made the greatest use of the handbook, indicating 100 per cent and 87.51 per cent use, respectively. In other words, seven of eight class B schools used handbooks while all twenty class A schools found them of value.

³A debate handbook is defined as a commercially prepared publication containing debate evidence, cases, strategy, etc., for a specific debate topic.

3. Recording Devices. Comparison of 1952 and 1961 studies could not be accurately compared in regard to the use of recording devices.

TABLE XXIV
SCHOOLS MAKING USE OF RECORDING DEVICES
1952

	High School Classification						Totals	%
	AA	%	A	%	B	%		
Number of schools	12	75.00	8	80.00	8	80.00	28	77.78

TABLE XXV
RECORDING DEVICES SPECIFICALLY FOR
DEBATE PROGRAMS
1961

	High School Classification						Totals	%
	AA	%	A	%	B	%		
Number of schools	10	38.46	6	30.00	5	62.51	21	37.04

Kelso, in his study, attempted to show how many schools had access to and used a recording device. Results of the 1952 survey disclosed that twenty-eight of the thirty-six surveyed schools made use of a recording device in their debate program. This ratio constituted a 77.78 percentage. Class B schools reported that all ten schools made use of

such equipment. Class A and AA reported eight of ten for an 80 per cent average, and twelve of sixteen for 75 per cent respectively.

The 1961 study was constructed to indicate the number of Kansas debate programs that had acquired recording devices specifically for use by the debate program. When this stipulation was injected into the questionnaire the replies produced the fact that twenty of the fifty-four surveyed schools provided recorders for specific use in debate. The 37.04 per cent average was chiefly influenced by the eight class B schools. In class B, five schools or 62.51 per cent had debate programs with recording units. Ten of twenty-six, constituting 38.46 per cent, class AA schools of Kansas provided recording equipment; and six of twenty, or 30 per cent of class A schools, found the policy desirable. In compilation of data no attempt was made to determine if a debate program was provided with more than one recording device.

WHAT WAS THE SOURCE, SIZE, AND USE OF DEBATE FUNDS IN THE SCHOOLS IN KANSAS?

From what sources do you receive funds for operating the debate program? The 1952 and 1961 surveys disclosed a variety of methods used in securing funds for financing Kansas high school debate programs.

TABLE XXVI

SOURCE OF DEBATE BUDGET
1952

Source	High School Classification			Totals	%
	AA	A	B		
No budget			1	1	2.22
B.O.E. Paid budget	13	8	72.72	29	64.44
H.S. Activity ticket	3	1	9.09	4	8.88
Dramatic productions				1	2.22
Sale of sports programs	2	8.69		2	4.44
Sale of advertising	2	8.69		2	4.44
Sale of cokes and candy	3	13.04	18.18	5	11.11
Women's clubs donations			1	1	2.22
Totals	23	11	11	45	

TABLE XXVII

SOURCE OF DEBATE BUDGET
1961

Source*	High School Classification			Totals	%
	AA	A	B		
B.O.E. Paid budget	22	14	70.00	40	66.66
Activity ticket	4	2	10.00	6	10.00
Not definite	1	3	15.00	8	13.33
Sale of foodstuffs	2	1	5.00	3	5.00
Sale of advertising	1			1	1.67
Others	2	6.06		2	3.33
Totals	33	20	8	60	

*Some schools made use of more than one method of securing funds.

Table XXVI records that in 1952, 64.44 per cent of surveyed debate programs received all or part of their financial support from their respective Boards of Education. The activity fund accounted for all or partial funds in 8.88 per cent of the schools. The sale of foodstuffs was prevalent in five schools, or 11.11 per cent of the schools. Advertising was used by two schools, or 4.44 per cent of those surveyed. Other methods were used in 8.33 per cent of the programs.

In 1961, methods of financing the program appeared to be the same illustrated by the Kelso study. The individual schools' Boards of Education still constituted the most frequent source of funds. In regard to the overall average, 66.66 per cent of the Kansas debate programs received all or part of their financial support from the Board of Education. The school activity fund accounted for funds in 10 per cent of the schools. In the case of eight schools, or 13.33 per cent, it was stated that the budget was not definite. The term "not definite" includes those schools who must earn all their own funds and those who receive money from the school, determined by the program needs and not a fixed budgeted amount. Sale of foodstuffs was the source of funds in 5 per cent of the programs. The sale of advertising was used in only 1.67 per cent of the surveyed schools. Other methods accounted for funds

in only 3.33 per cent of the program.

What is the size of your debate budget? In order to ascertain the total amount of funds spent for the debate program in a given school and on a state wide basis, data were collected to determine what the average school in each classification was providing for the debate program.

TABLE XXVIII
SIZE OF DEBATE BUDGET
1952

Size of budget	High School Classification						Totals	%
	AA	%	A	%	B*	%		
Not definite	1	6.25	3	30.00	2	22.22	6	17.14
\$ 0- 100			1	10.00	4	44.44	5	14.29
150- 300	5	31.25	4	40.00			9	25.71
400- 700	8	50.00	1	10.00	2	22.22	11	31.42
1000-1200	2	12.50	1	10.00	1	11.11	4	11.42
Totals	16		10		9		35	

*One school did not reply.

TABLE XXIX
 SIZE OF DEBATE BUDGET
 1961

Size of budget	High School Classification						Totals	%
	AA	%	A	%	B	%		
Not definite	1	3.84	7	35.00	6	75.00	14	25.92
\$ 0- 100			1	5.00			1	1.85
125- 250	1	3.84	1	5.00	1	12.50	3	5.55
300- 500	4	15.38	6	30.00	1	12.50	11	20.37
550- 800	4	15.38	2	10.00			6	11.11
850-1000	8	30.76	1	5.00			9	16.66
1200-2000	6	23.07	2	10.00			8	14.81
2000-3000	2	7.69					2	3.70
Totals	26		20		8		54	

Analysis revealed that in 1952 the average budget for the surveyed schools was \$383.33. When schools that paid no money for support of the debate program were omitted, the average rose to \$492.85. This figure omits the one school that received money from the Board of Education but not a fixed sum. Class AA schools possessed the highest average budget, \$507.81. Class A and B schools operated on average budgets of \$360 and \$207.50 respectively. Data compiled in 1961 indicated that class AA schools still possessed the larger average budgets, the exact average being \$984.03. Class A schools operated on an average of \$402.50, while class B schools received \$75

per school on the average. The class B average was not representative due to five of the eight schools indicating "no budget" or "no definite budget." The over-all 1961 average was \$633.98.

The results when analyzed by class did not omit schools accorded "no budget" or an "indefinite budget." The differential when these schools were omitted from the tabulations was the difference between \$633.98 and \$855.87, or \$221.69. Most of the differential caused by the omission of those schools was created by the budgeting policies of small class A and B schools.

How much does your school pay towards the meal expenses of the student, coach, and sponsor other than the coach? The collection of data relevant to the expenditure of debate funds in both the 1952 and 1961 surveys considered three basic areas. These areas were: (1) the cost of food, (2) the cost of travel, and (3) the cost of lodging.

TABLE XXX
EXPENDITURES FOR STUDENTS MEALS
1952

Amt. paid	High School Classification						Totals	%
	AA	%	A	%	B	%		
All	5	31.25	1	10.00	1	10.00	7	19.44
\$1 per meal			1	10.00			1	2.77
Other	7	43.75	1	10.00	4	40.00	12	33.33
None	4	25.00	7	70.00	5	50.00	16	44.44
Totals	16		10		10		36	

TABLE XXXI
EXPENDITURES FOR STUDENTS MEALS
1961

Amt. paid	High School Classification						Totals	%
	AA	%	A*	%	B**	%		
All	4	15.38	8	42.10	2	11.76	14	26.41
\$1 per meal	4	15.38	3	15.78			7	13.46
Other	4	15.38	1	5.26	5	29.41	10	19.23
None	<u>14</u>	<u>53.84</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>36.84</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>58.82</u>	<u>31</u>	<u>59.61</u>
Totals	26		19		17		52	

*One school did not reply.
**Two schools did not reply.

Kelso's study asserted that only seven of the thirty-six schools paid all expenses for students meals. This 19.44 per cent was dominated by the class AA schools where five of the seven schools were located. Class A and B each had one school that paid all student meals. One of the thirty-six surveyed schools paid for students meals at the rate of \$1 per meal. Twelve, or 33.33 per cent, provided lesser sums for paying expenses of students meals. Sixteen schools, comprising 44.44 per cent of all schools, paid nothing for student meals.

The present study indicated that for an over-all average the percentages have varied very little. During 1960-1961, 25.93 per cent of the schools paid all student meal expenses. This was an increase of 6.49 per cent.

The policy of paying a fixed rate of \$1 per meal increased by 10.68 per cent, from 2.78 per cent to 13.46 per cent. Amounts paid, other than those mentioned, appeared to be less desirable since a decline of 14.08 per cent was reported by the responding schools.

The original study made no attempt to collect data relevant to school policies on payment of meals for coaches and sponsors. Such material was included in the 1961 survey in an attempt to provide additional data.

TABLE XXXII
EXPENDITURES FOR COACHES MEALS
1961

Amt. paid	High School Classification						Totals	%
	AA	%	A	%	B	%		
All	15	57.69	10	50.00	2	25.00	27	50.00
\$1 per meal	4	15.38	1	5.00			5	9.26
Other	3	11.53	4	20.00	5	62.50	12	22.22
None	4	15.38	5	25.00	1	12.50	10	18.52
Totals	26		20		8		54	

TABLE XXXIII
EXPENDITURES FOR SPONSORS MEALS
1961

Amt. paid	High School Classification						Totals	%
	AA	%	A	%	B	%		
All	13	50.00	9	45.00	1	13.50	23	42.59
\$1 per meal	4	15.38	1	5.00			5	9.25
Other	3	11.53	3	15.00	3	32.50	9	16.66
None	6	23.07	7	35.00	4	50.00	17	31.48
Totals	26		20		8		54	

The policy of providing meal allowances for coaches appeared to be more common than the policy of providing meal allowances for students. Twenty-seven or 50.00 per cent of all schools replying indicated payment of all meal expenses incurred by the coach. This percentage was double that found when surveying student meal policies. The policy of paying \$1 per meal was not as prevalent when applied to coaches.

The greatest area of difference was in regard to the number of schools that paid nothing for student meals and the number that paid nothing for coaches meals. Only ten schools indicated that the debate coach was paid nothing towards his meal expenses, while twenty-four paid nothing for student meals while on debate trips. In other words, 25.92 per cent of the schools paid for coaches meals and paid nothing for students meals.

In regard to meal funds paid to trip sponsors, other than the debate coach, the major difference appeared to be a policy of five schools to not pay anything towards the sponsors meal expense while paying all meal expenses for the coach.

How much does your school pay for the use of private cars? Survey results disclosed that past and present travel policies have been based upon the use of both private and school owned vehicles for transportation to and

from debate tournaments. Both the pilot study and the 1961 study attempted to determine what was being paid out of the schools' debate budgets for adequate transportation facilities.

TABLE XXXIV
EXPENDITURE FOR USE OF PRIVATE CAR
1952

Amount per mile	High School Classification						Totals	%
	AA	%	A	%	B	%		
1 1/2¢			1	11.11			1	3.03
4¢							0	0.00
5¢	6	35.29	5	55.55	1	14.28	12	36.36
6¢	4	23.52			1	14.28	5	15.15
7¢	6	35.29	2	22.22	4	57.14	12	36.36
8¢	1	5.88					1	3.03
10¢			1	11.11	1	14.28	2	6.06
Totals	17		9		7		33	

TABLE XXXV
EXPENDITURE FOR USE OF PRIVATE CAR
1961

Amount per mile	High School Classification						Totals	%
	AA	%	A	%	B	%		
None	3	11.53	1	3.33	1	12.50	5	9.25
4¢							0	0.00
5¢	3	11.53	1	3.33	2	25.00	6	11.11
6¢	1	3.84	1	3.33	1	12.50	3	5.55
6 1/2¢	1	3.84					1	1.85
7¢	12	46.15	11	36.66	2	25.00	25	46.29
7 1/2¢	1	3.84	4	13.33	1	12.50	6	11.11
8¢	2	7.69			1	12.50	3	5.55
9¢							0	0.00
10¢	2	7.69	1	3.33			3	5.55
Gas	1	3.84	1	3.33			2	3.70
Totals	26		30		8		54	

In 1952 an average of 5.65 cents per mile was paid for the use of private cars to transport students. This figure, however, was not totally accurate since some schools relied on gratis transportation facilities. When these schools were omitted, the state average rose to 6.17 cents per mile. When only the schools actually paying mileage were considered, it appeared that class AA schools were paying the highest mileage rate, this being an average of 6.06 cents per mile. Class A and B paid 5.10 cents and 5.60 cents per mile respectively.

The lapse of nine years appeared to make little change in the amount paid per mile for transportation by private car. The 1961 survey disclosed that an average of 6.03 cents per mile was paid by Kansas high school debate programs. When corrected, by removing schools that paid no mileage, this figure rose to 6.51 cents per mile. Class A schools on the average paid higher per mile rates than classes AA and B. Class A schools were paying 6.74 cents per mile, while class AA and B were paying 5.85 cents per mile and 5.64 cents per mile respectively.

What does your school charge for the use of a school owned car for transportation of debate students? The Kelso survey of 1952 did not investigate the policy of using school cars for debate travel, possibly because the policy became possible and popular in just the last few years.

Whatever the reason, the lack of that data limited consideration of that area to the 1961 survey.

TABLE XXXVI
EXPENDITURES FOR USE OF SCHOOL CARS
1961

Amount per mile	High School Classification						Totals	%
	AA	%	A	%	B	%		
None			4	80.00	5	100.00	9	60.00
4¢			1	20.00			1	6.66
5¢							0	0.00
6¢							0	0.00
6½¢	1	20.00					1	6.66
7¢	2	40.00					2	13.33
7½¢	1	20.00					1	6.66
8¢							0	0.00
9¢							0	0.00
10¢							0	0.00
Gas	1	20.00					1	6.66
Totals	5		5		5		15	

In 1961, for those schools using school cars, debate programs paid an average of 6.50 cents per mile. Class AA schools paid an average of 6.40 cents per mile, while class A schools reported paying an average of 6.75 cents per mile. No class B school reported having to pay for use of school cars.

In regard to the type of vehicle used by schools for student transportation most were of the eight and nine passenger type.

Does your school pay for lodging expenses of the debater? Although the policy of payment for meals and transportation varied during and since the 1952 study, school policy toward payment of lodging while on debate trips was discovered to be relatively consistent. When the Kelso data were compiled thirty-three of the thirty-six, 91.66 per cent, paid all lodging expenses. The remaining three paid nothing. The three minority schools were small class B schools.

TABLE XXXVII

EXPENDITURES FOR LODGING
1952

Amt. paid	High School Classification						Totals	%
	AA	%	A	%	B	%		
All	16	100.00	10	100.00	7	70.00	33	91.66
None					3	30.00	3	8.33
Other							0	0.00
Totals	16		10		10		36	

TABLE XXXVIII

EXPENDITURES FOR LODGING
1961

Amt. paid	High School Classification						Totals	%
	AA	%	A	%	B	%		
All	22	84.61	14	70.00	6	75.00	42	77.77
None	3	11.53	4	20.00	2	25.00	9	16.66
Other	1	3.84	2	10.00			3	5.55
Totals	26		20		8		54	

By 1961 the high average of 1952 had diminished somewhat, but the policy of paying all lodging expenses was still predominant. In 1961, 77.77 per cent of all schools paid the complete lodging expense. Nine schools paid nothing and two had adopted other means of meeting this financial obligation. Table XXXVIII summarizes this data.

WHAT IS THE STATUS OF CONTEST
DEBATING IN KANSAS?

Do you believe in contest debating? In both 1952 and 1961, the Kansas debate coaches were asked to state their opinion on the value of contest debating. The Kelso survey disclosed that 91.67 per cent of the coaches felt contest debating was a desirable activity. The three coaches who opposed contest debating were representatives of class AA (2) and class B (1) schools.

An increase of those supporting contest debating rose 2.77 per cent during the nine year span. Since both years indicated a strong favorable feeling toward debate as a program it was possible that the larger scope of the 1961 survey could have been the factor which created an increase of 2.77 per cent. The three occasions where the coaches did not vote favorably for contest debating were equally distributed throughout all three classifications. It was noted that in the case of the class B school, the coach stated a definite negative feeling toward contest debating,

while the class AA and class A coaches chose not to answer the question. All three teachers were graduates of Kansas colleges or universities.

Will increased financial remuneration help increase the number of Kansas coaching personnel? Forty-four coaches (81.48 per cent) felt that this result would occur if coaches' wages would increase, four felt it would have no effect and six either had no opinion or chose not to answer the question. Those with a negative opinion or no opinion comprised 18.51 per cent of the total number surveyed. No attempt was made in 1952 to secure this data.

TABLE XXXIX

INCREASED FINANCIAL REMUNERATION FOR COACHING
1961

Coaches opinion	High School Classification						Totals	%
	AA	%	A	%	B	%		
Increase	24	92.31	15	75.00	5	62.50	44	81.48
No increase			2	10.00	2	25.00	4	7.40
No answer	<u>2</u>	7.69	<u>3</u>	15.00	<u>1</u>	12.50	<u>6</u>	11.11
Totals	26		20		8		54	

HOW DO KANSAS DEBATE COACHES EVALUATE STATE
CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS FOR COACHING DEBATE?

Are present certification requirements for coaching debate adequate, too lax, or too restrictive? To determine to what extent Kansas debate coaches felt that the state

certification requirements for coaching debate were adequate, the surveyed coaches were asked to indicate if they thought the requirements were: (1) too lax, (2) adequate, or (3) too restrictive.

TABLE XL
CERTIFICATION OF DEBATE COACHES
1961

Certifi- cation re- quirements	High School Classification						Totals	%
	AA	%	A	%	B	%		
Adequate	9	34.62	11	55.00	6	75.00	26	48.14
Too lax	12	46.15	7	35.00	2	25.00	21	38.88
Too re- strictive							0	0.00
No answer	5	19.23	2	10.00			7	12.96
Totals	26		20		8		54	

Seven coaches left the question blank; twenty-six felt the requirements were adequate; and twenty-one indicated that requirements were too lax. In class AA, 34.62 per cent of the coaches supported the present standards; 46.15 per cent indicated that the requirements were too lax. Those choosing not to state an opinion comprised 19.23 per cent.

Class A coaches voted 55 per cent in favor of present regulations, 35 per cent feeling they were too lax, and 10 per cent expressed no opinion.

The largest support for present certification requirements came from class B schools where 75 per cent of

the coaches expressed a favorable attitude toward present regulations. The remaining 25 per cent felt the requirements were too lax. The Kelso survey did not investigate this area.

WHAT LIMITATIONS EXISTED IN THE
DEBATE PROGRAMS OF KANSAS?

Is your present debate program adequate? To determine the over-all quality of the individual debate program administered by the specific coach, the coach was asked if the debate program at his school was adequate.

TABLE XLI

COACHES EVALUATION OF PROGRAM ADEQUACY
1961

Program adequate	High School Classification						Totals	%
	AA	%	A	%	B	%		
Yes	12	46.15	7	35.00	5	62.50	24	44.44
No	14	53.84	11	55.00	3	37.50	28	51.85
No answer			2	10.00			2	3.70
Totals	26		20		8		54	

Data collected in 1961 disclosed that the debate coaches in the state were about evenly divided regarding the status of their programs. Twenty-four, constituting 44.44 per cent felt their program was adequate; twenty-eight, representing 51.85 per cent, indicated that their respective programs were not adequate. Two coaches, or 3.70 per cent, did not reply.

Class AA and A schools indicated that on the average, a majority of programs in those classifications were inadequate while class B schools strongly praised their programs. This support was not expected in view of the average size of class B squads, budgets, and scope of activities. No figures for 1952 were available for comparison.

The 1961 study used the identical areas of limitations constructed by Kelso. These limitations were: (1) lack of student interest, (2) lack of financial support, (3) lack of community interest, (4) lack of administrative support, (5) extra-curricular conflicts, (6) curricular conflicts, and (7) others.

Table XLII discloses that in 1952 extra-curricular and curricular conflicts constituted the greatest limitation to the Kansas high school debate program. Administrative support appeared to be a lesser limitation to the program; however, class AA schools ranked it as the greatest limitation.

In 1961 administrative support, on the average, was the lesser limitation of those names; however, class AA schools still constituted the largest classification listing it as a limitation. As was the case in 1952, extra-curricular and curricular conflicts appeared to be the greatest limitation to the debate program. All limitations

TABLE XLII

LIMITATIONS OF THE PROGRAM
1952

Reason for limitation	High School Classification			Totals*	%
	AA	A	B		
Lack student interest	4	11.42	4	11	21.05
Lack financial support	7	20.00	2	11	10.52
Extra-curricular conflict	4	11.42	4	14	21.05
Lack administrative encouragement	6	17.14	1	7	5.26
Curricular conflict	7	20.00	4	16	21.05
Lack community interest	5	14.28	2	8	10.52
No limitations	2	5.71	2	6	10.52
Totals	35	19	19	73	

*Some schools checked more than one item.

TABLE XLIII

LIMITATIONS OF THE PROGRAM
1961

Reason for limitation	High School Classification			Totals*	%
	AA	A	B		
Lack student interest	7	15.55	2	16	18.18
Lack financial support	9	20.00	1	13	9.09
Extra-curricular conflict	11	24.44	4	29	36.36
Lack administrative support	4	8.88	1	7	9.09
Curricular conflict	9	20.00	2	20	18.18
Lack community interest	4	8.88	1	12	9.09
Others	1	2.22		1	
Totals	45	42	11	98	

*Some schools checked more than one item.

retained approximately the same relationship to the sum and total of limitations established in 1952. One school did extend the six basic limitations to indicate the lack of a strong junior high school debate program.

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

CONCLUSIONS

The following conclusions became evident regarding the subdivided problems stated on page two of this study. All conclusions are based on comparative averages.

Preparation and Experience.

1. The average Kansas debate coach holds 32.33 college hours of speech training as opposed to 18.50 hours in 1952. The reason being the existence of coaching personnel with a greater background in speech education.

2. Kansas debate coaching personnel were primarily trained in Kansas colleges and universities. Sixty per cent of all degrees held by Kansas coaches were received from Kansas institutions.

3. The average Kansas debate coach had acquired 6.69 years of experience. This constitutes a 1.67 years increase since 1952. The reason for this low increase in experience was due to employment turnover among Kansas coaching personnel. As was proven, the class AA coaches had acquired the greatest number of years of experience and the class B coaches the least.

Responsibilities of the Coach.

4. Only 1.85 per cent more coaches, on the average, held tournaments in 1961 than in 1952.

5. In 1961, 81.48 per cent of the debate coaches were also responsible for some speech festival activities. This average was an increase of 11.48 per cent from 1952.

6. The increase noted in the aforementioned conclusion may have been influenced by the larger sampling of the 1961 survey.

Special Considerations Given the Debate Coach.

7. Additional salary for coaching debate rose on the average only \$80.87 from 1952 to 1961.

8. Class AA schools were paying the higher additional salaries while class A schools were paying the lowest.

9. The policy of reducing a coaches teaching assignments, due to the coaching duties, diminished 14.82 per cent from 1952 to 1961, when it became virtually non-existent.

Status in Regard to Curriculum.

10. Debate, as a school activity, was administered both curricularly and extra-curricularly. Some schools practice both procedures.

11. Only 38.58 per cent of Kansas debate programs are extra-curricular.

12. Class B schools were the largest subscribers to the policy of sponsoring the debate program both as a curricular and extra-curricular activity. This practice being necessary due to small enrollment.

13. Class AA and A schools offer debate both within and outside the curriculum in less than 20 per cent of the schools.

14. The average number of possible high school credits for debate is 2.13 credits. This is unchanged from the 1952 average.

Teaching Aids.

15. While the use of a debate text increased 7.40 per cent it is still a minority practice.

16. Ninety per cent of all 1961 schools surveyed made use of one or more commercial handbooks. Comparison with 1952 practices was impossible due to the lack of data.

17. The use of the electronic recording devices was widely adopted in both 1952 and 1961.

Debate Budget Source, Size, and Expenditure.

18. The "Board of Education" was listed as the source of debate funds more times than all other sources combined. This was true in both 1952 and 1961.

19. The policy of soliciting funds from civic groups has disappeared since 1952.

20. The over-all average of Kansas debate budgets has risen \$141.13 since 1952. Large increases achieved by class AA schools make the average misleading because of the lack of similar progress in class A and B.

21. On the average, debate programs increased by 5.87 students from 1952 to 1961.

22. Class AA high schools increased, on the average, 12.57 students from 1952 to 1961. This wide deviation from the over-all average was due to a decrease in the squad size of class A and B schools.

23. Procedures used in the 1952 study when compared to the 1961 survey make the over-all average misleading.

24. In class B the policy of providing no budget was still the most popular policy.

25. In regard to payment of coaches' meal expenses, payment of all meal costs was still the most widely followed.

26. The amount paid per mile for the use of private cars has risen only .34 cents per mile since 1952.

27. The use of school owned cars for transportation was approximately the same per mile as for private cars, that cost being around six cents per mile. The only advantage in using school vehicles was larger capacity and availability.

28. With just a few exceptions the policy of debate funds paying all lodging costs of debaters was universal.

Status of Contest Debating in Kansas.

29. Over 92 per cent of Kansas debate coaches supported competitive debate as a beneficial activity.

30. None of the Kansas debate coaches indicated that present certification requirements for coaching debate were too restrictive.

31. Twenty-six of the forty-seven coaches responding to this question approved present certification requirements.

32. The remaining twenty-one of the forty-seven respondents desire stronger certification requirements for coaching debate in Kansas.

Limitations.

33. The survey disclosed that in both 1952 and 1961 curricular and extra-curricular conflicts were a major limitation to the progress of debate programs.

34. It was shown that in 1961, as in 1952, that the limitations of a debate program were the result of many factors.

Additional Conclusions. In securing answers to the questions stated on page two, the following pertinent data was secured.

35. On a state wide average, five more students per school were participating in the debate program than in 1952.

36. Schools participating in debate attended an average of 3.64 more tournaments than did their counterparts in 1952.

37. The number of tournaments per student has remained relatively constant since 1952, having shown only a .32 tournament increase per student.

38. Two of the eight recommendations by Kelso had been accepted. These recommendations asserted that school administrators should hire debate coaches with more formal speech training.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The data collected in the 1961 survey when compared with the data of the 1952 study indicated certain areas which justify the following recommendations.

1. That Kansas colleges and universities need to encourage debate coaches in the state to begin work on the development of a larger and better trained coaching staff.

2. That class A school administrators need to re-evaluate their debate programs in terms of budget, organization, and personnel.

3. That policies which caused the improvement of Kansas debate programs since 1952 be continued.

4. That due to a strong, although minority, expression by debate coaches that certification requirements are too lax, this area be more fully investigated.

5. That there is a need for a periodical study in the area of this survey in order to obtain data and re-evaluate the condition of the over-all program. It would appear that a ten year period would be sufficient.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS

Ross, C. C. and Stanley, Julian C., Measurement in Today's Schools. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall Inc., 1954.

B. PUBLICATIONS OF LEARNED ORGANIZATIONS

The Kansas State High School Activities Association, Official Handbook, 1951-1952. Compiled by E. A. Thomas, Commissioner; Carl H. Kopelk, and Wanda May Vinson, Assistants to the Commissioner. Topeka, Kansas: Association Headquarters.

C. UNPUBLISHED MATERIALS

Blackin, David J., "A Statistical Report of the Financial Status of Debate in the State of Kansas 1956-1957." Unpublished individual report, Kansas State Teachers College, Emporia, 1957.

Blackin, David J., "A Statistical Report of the Financial Status of Debate in the State of Kansas 1959-1960." Unpublished individual report, Russell High School, Russell, Kansas, 1960.

Kelso, John E., "An Evaluation of High School Debate in Kansas for the Year 1951-1952." Unpublished Master's Thesis, Kansas State Teachers College, Emporia, 1952.

APPENDIX A

Questionnaire on the Status of Debate
in Kansas High Schools

Russell High School
 Russell, Kansas
 January 1, 1961

Dear Debate Coach,

Your answers to the following questions will help me determine the financial status of debate in Kansas high schools and will help me prepare my masters thesis. Enclosed is a stamped self-addressed envelope so will you please fill out the questionnaire and return it to me TODAY.

QUESTIONNAIRE ON THE FINANCIAL STATUS OF DEBATE IN KANSAS
 HIGH SCHOOLS

Name _____ High School _____
 School Classification (AA-A, etc.) _____ Enrollment _____

The Debate Coach

1. Total college credits you have in speech: _____
 Discussion _____, Debate and public speaking _____,
 Others _____.
2. What degrees do you hold? _____
3. From what institutions do you hold degrees? _____
4. Extra salary you receive above the schedule for coaching debate. \$ _____.
5. Number of hours reduced from teaching load because of debate coaching. _____.
6. Number of years experience in coaching debate. _____.
7. Are you responsible for second semester speech activities sponsored by the KSHSAA? _____.
8. Do you direct an invitational debate tournament? _____.

Your Debate Program

1. Is your program curricular? _____ Extracurricular? _____
2. Each student can obtain a total of _____ semester credits for debate.
3. What is the average size of your debate squad? _____.
4. What is the average number of tournaments attended by your school? _____.
5. What is the average number of tournaments attended by each student? _____.
6. How many years has your school had a competitive debate program? _____.
7. Do you make use of a debate text? _____.
8. Do you use commercial debate handbooks? _____.
9. Do you have a recording device specifically for use by the debate squad? _____.

Practice Rms.

Your Debate Budget

1. You secure your debate budget from: (Check more than one if more than one applies) Board of Education _____ High School Activity Ticket _____ Dramatic Productions _____ Selling athletic programs _____ Selling advertising _____ Selling foodstuffs _____ No definite budget _____ Other _____ sources _____.
2. What is the size of your budget? \$ _____.
3. What does the school pay per mile for use of private cars? _____.
4. Answer only if school vehicle is used. What does your school charge per mile for use of a school vehicle? _____
 Excluding driver how many students will the vehicle carry? _____.
5. How much does your school pay towards the expense of students meals? _____ Coaches _____ Sponsor other than coach _____.

3

6. How much does the school pay for students lodging? _____.

Recommendations

1. We believe in contest debating? Yes _____ No _____.
2. There needs to be greater financial remuneration to encourage more qualified college students into the field of debate coaching. Yes _____ No _____.
3. State certification requirements for coaching debate are adequate _____ too lax _____ too restrictive _____.
4. Do you feel that your program is adequate? _____.
5. We feel that our program is limited because of:
 Lack of student interest _____
 Lack of financial support _____
 Lack of community interest _____
 Lack of administrative support _____
 Extracurricular conflict _____
 Curricular conflict _____
6. Outline any additional material you feel would be useful in the preparation of this study.

Thank you for your cooperation. All information will be kept confidential.

Sincerely,

David J. Blackim

Enclosure

APPENDIX B

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONNAIRE

Summary of Q

Class AA	1	2	3	4	5
Total Hours	20	20	62	38	60
Degrees	B.S.	B.A.	B.S. - M.A.	B.A.	B.A.
Institutions	KSTC - Pitt.	Wichita U.	KSTC - Emporia	St. Marys of Xavier, Ks.	Univ. of Missouri
Extra Salary	\$200	\$100	None	None	State
Reduced Load	None	None	None	None	\$900
Experience	None	21	5	9	9
Spring Activities	None	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Hold Tournament	Yes	No	No	No	Yes
Program Curriculum	Yes	No	Both	No	Yes
Total Credits	1	21	1	21	13
Aver. Squad Size	4	12	14	10	20-100
Aver. Tourn. School	6	14	10	8	15-20
Aver. Tourn. Student	4	5	4	5	12
Program Existence	1	5	13	4	20
Use Text	No	No	No	No	No
Use Handbooks	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Recording Device	No	No	No	No	No
Source of Budget	B.O.E.	B.O.E.	B.O.E. + Others	Others	B.O.E. - Ast. Jobs
Size of Budget	\$500	\$400	\$300	\$125	\$1000
Mileage - Private Car	1¢	1¢	1¢	None	8¢
Mileage - School Car	—	—	—	—	—
Students Meals	None	\$1 P. Meal	None	None	None
Coaches Meals	All	Unlimited	All	None	All
Sponsors Meals	None	Unlimited	None	None	All
Lodging	None	All	None	None	All
Courtset	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Larger Coaching Pay	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Is Program Adequate	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
State Certification	Adequate	Adequate	Adequate	Adequate	Too late
Limitations:					
Lack Student Int.					
Lack Financial Support			✓		
Lack Comm. Int.					
Lack Admin. Support		✓			
Extra-Curr. Conflict		✓		✓	
Curricular Conflict		✓			

Summary

Class AA	12	13	14	15	16
Total Hours	8	29	36	3	29
Degrees	B.A.	B.A.	B.S.	B.S.	B.S. & B.A.
Institutions	Wichita U.	George Appardine College	KSTC - H. Hays	KSTC - Pi. H.	K.U.
Extra Salary	\$300	\$300	\$400	\$600	\$300
Reduced Load	None	None	None	None	None
Experience	7	2 1/2	3	1	2
Spring Activities	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Wld. Tournament	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
Program Curricula	Both	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Total Credits	3	3	12	6	—
Avar. Squad Size	30-50	30-25	30	12	20
Avar. Team Schol	15-25	14	15	9	10
Avar. Team Student	4	4	3	5	5
Program Existence	40+	20-30	12	3	2
Use Text	No	No	No	No	Yes
Use Handbooks	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Recording Device	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Source of Budget	B.O.E. ^{Food & Act. Ticket}	B.O.E.	B.O.E.	B.O.E.	B.O.E. ^{Activity Ticket}
Size of Budget	\$2-3000	\$600	\$1000	\$850	\$1300
Mileage - Private Car	22.8 ^{22.8 Miles}	14	None	14	—
Mileage - School Car	—	—	9	—	—
Students Meals	2-8-1.00	None	#2 P. Day	#1 P. Meal	None
Coaches Meals	Same	#1 P. Meal	All	#1 P. Meal	None
Sponsors Meals	Same	#1 P. Meal	All	#1 P. Meal	None
Lodging	All	All	All	All	All
Contact Debatng	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Larger Coaching Pay	—	Yes	Yes	—	Yes
Is Program Adeq.	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
State Certification	Adequate	—	Adequate	Too lat	Too lat
Limitations:					
Lack Student Int.				✓	✓
Lack Financial Support		✓	✓		
Lack Comm. Test					
Lack Admin. Support					
Extra-Curr. Conflict		✓			
Curricular Conflict	✓	✓		✓	✓

Summary Continued

Class	AA	23	24	25	26
Total Hours		47	14	40	56
Degrees		B.A.	B.S.-M.A.	B.A.	B.S.-M.S.
Institutions		Wichita U.	KSTC - Ft. Hays K.C. U.	Par. K College	KSTC - Pitt.
Extra Salary		\$200	\$200	None	\$150
Reduced Load		None	None	None	None
Experience		1	15	2	18
Spring Activities		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Hold Tournament		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Program Curricular		No	Yes	Yes	Both
Total Credits		None	3	1 1/2	2
Aver. Squad Size		18	100	10	24
Aver. Tourn-School		10	—	6	14
Aver. Tourn-Student		4	9	5	5
Program Existence		7	—	6	50
Use Text		No	No	No	No
Use Handbooks		No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Recording Device		Yes	No	No	Yes
Source of Budget		B.O.E.	B.O.E.	Not Definite	B.O.E.
Size of Budget		\$800	\$1000	Not Definite	\$1200
Mileage-Private Car		7¢	7¢	5¢	5¢ - 7¢
Mileage-School Car		—	—	—	4¢-8
Students Meals		50¢ P Meal	None	None	None
Coaches Meals		1/2 P Meal	All	All	All
Sponsors Meals		1 P Meal	All	All	All
Lodging		All	All	All	All
Contest Debating		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Larger Coaching Pay		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
To Program Adequate		No	Yes	No	Yes
State Certification		Too lax	Adequate	—	Too lax
<u>LIMITATIONS:</u>					
Lack Student Int.				✓	
Lack Financial Support		✓		✓	
Lack Comm. Int.		✓			
Lack Admin. Support		✓			
Extra-Curr. Conflict		✓		✓	
Curricular Conflict				✓	

Summary C.

Class A	1	2	3	4	5	6
Total Hours	30	24	55	9	40	
Degrees	B.A.	B.A.	B.A.-M.A.	B.A.-MT.-M.S.	B.S.	B.
Institutions	Southwestern	Panhandle A.S.M.	William Jewell	Subiaco Ark. NW State - Okla	K. State	OK
"		Goodwell, Okla	U. of Iowa	KSTC - Ft. Hays		
Extra Salary	\$100	\$50	\$200	None	\$100	
Reduced Load	None	None	1	None	None	
Experience	3	1	2	4	1	
Spring Activities	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	
Hold Tournament	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	
Program Curricular	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	
Total Credits	None	2	1 1/2	1/4	4	Not
Aver. Squad Size	8	5	8-10	12	12	
Aver. Journ. - School	2-3	4	9	5	5	
Aver. Journ. - Student	2-3	4	5	5	4	
Program Existence	3	2	10	4	2	
Use Text	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	
Use Handbooks	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Recording Device	Yes	No	No	No	No	
Source of Budget	B.O.E.	B.O.E.	General Fund	Not Specific	B.O.E.	B.
Size of Budget	Not Definite	\$300	\$350	Not Specific	\$500	Not
Mileage - Private Car	10¢	7 1/2¢	7¢	7¢	7¢	
Mileage - School Car	—	None/6	—	None/7	—	Not
Students Meals	All	\$1 P. Day	\$1 P. Meal	None	\$1 P. Meal	
Coaches Meals	All	\$1 P. Day	\$1.25 P. Meal	None	\$1.50 P. Meal	
Sponsors Meals	All	\$1 P. Day	\$1.25 P. Meal	None	\$1.50 P. Meal	
Lodging	All	\$2 P. Student	\$4 P. Day	None	All	
Contest Debating	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Larger Coaching Pay	—	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	
Is Program Adequate	—	No	Yes	No	No	
State Certification	—	Adequate	Adequate	Too lax	Too lax	Ad
LIMITATIONS:						
Lack Student Int.	✓	✓			✓	
Lack Financial Support						
Lack Comm. Int.		✓		✓	✓	
Lack Admin. Support	✓					
Extra-Curr. Conflict	✓	✓		✓	✓	
Curricular Conflict		✓		✓	✓	

Summary Con

Class A	12	13	14	15	16	
Total Hours	20	29	18	31	70	
Degrees	B.A.	B.S.	B.A.	B.A.-M.A.	B.S.-M.A.	
Institutions	Bethel	KSTC-Emporia	Phillips U.	McPherson C.	KSTC-Emporia	NW
"				Uof S. Calif.	Denver U.	Teac
Extra Salary	\$350	\$200	None	None	College Staff	
Reduced Load	None	None	None	None	1	
Experience	7	None	2	22	7	
Spring Activities	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	
Held Tournament	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	
Program Curricular	Yes	Yes	No	Both	Yes	
Total Credits	4	3	None	21	4	
Aver. Squad Size	15-	10	6-8	12-18	16	
Aver. Tourn.-School	8	5	6	6	10	
Aver. Tourn.-Student	4	5	5	3	5	
Program Existence	7	3	2	20	7	
Use Text	No	No	No	No	No	
Use Handbooks	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Recording Device	Yes	No	No	No	No	
Source of Budget	B.O.E.	Not Definite	B.O.E.	B.O.E.	Activity Ticket	
Size of Budget	\$250	Not Definite	\$500	\$500	\$1200	
Mileage-Private Car	7¢	7 1/2¢	7 1/2¢	6¢	7¢	
Mileage-School Car	None/4	Bus N. Chg.	12¢/7	None/7	6¢/5-8	
Students Meals	All	None	\$1 P. meal	All	None	
Coaches Meals	All	\$1.50	\$1 P. meal	All	All	
Sponsors Meals	All	\$1.50	\$1 P. Meal	--	All	
Lodging	All	None	All	All	All	
Contest Debating	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Larger Coaching Pay	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Is Program Adequate	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	
State Certification	Adequate	Too lax	Too lax	Too lax	Adequate	
LIMITATIONS:						
Lack Student Int.		-				
Lack Financial Support		-				
Lack Comm. Int.			-			
Lack Admin. Support						
Extra-Curr. Conflict			-	-		
Curricular Conflict		-		-		

Summary Continued

Class B-BB	1	2	3	4	5
Total Hours	26	15	67	8	60
Degrees	B.A. - M.A.	B.F.A.	M.F.A.	P.A.	B.S.
Institutions	Bethel	OKla. U.	OKla. St. U.	Ottawa	KSTC - Pitt
"	K. U.		OKla. U.		
Extra Salary	None.	\$100	\$200	None	None.
Reduced Load	None.	None.	None.	None.	None.
Experiences	23	2	2	1	4
Spring Activities	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Held Tournament	No	No	No	No	No
Program Curricular	Both	No	Yes	Yes	Both
Total Credits	3	2	2	1/2	4
Aver. Squad Size	12	7	6	12	15
Aver. Tourn. - School	5	3	5	8	12
Aver. Tourn. - Student	4	3	5	5	5
Program Existence	10	21	Unknown	2	4
Use Text	No	No	No	No	Yes
Use Handbooks	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Recording Device	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
Source of Budget	B.O.E.	Not Definite	B.O.E.	B.O.E.	Not Definite
Size of Budget	\$250	Not Definite	\$300	Not Definite	Not Definite
Mileage - Private Car	5¢	8¢	5¢	7 1/2¢	7¢
Mileage - School Car	—	None/8	None/9	None/9	None/9
Students Meals	All	\$1.25 P. Day	All	\$1.25 P. Meal	75¢ P. Meal
Coaches Meals	All	\$2. P. Day	All	\$1.25 P. Meal	\$1.25 P. Meal
Sponsors Meals	—	None	All	\$1.25 P. Meal	None.
Lodging	All	All	All	All	All
Contest Deputing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Larger Coaching By	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	No
To Program Adequate	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Status Certification	Adequate	Too lax	Adequate	Too lax	Adequate
<u>LIMITATIONS:</u>					
Lack Student Int.		✓	✓		
Lack Financial Support					
Lack Common Int.					
Lack Admin. Support		✓			
Extra-Curr. Conflict			✓		✓
Curricular Conflict					✓

Summary Continued

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
36	15	67	8	60	9	40	15
A. M.A.	B.F.A.	M.F.A.	P.A.	B.S.	B.S.	B.S. - B.A.	B.A.
Other	OKla. U.	OKla. St. U.	Ottawa	KSTC - Pitt	N.W. State	KSTC - Emporia	Wichita U.
V. U.		OKla. U.			Tablequah		
None.	\$100	\$200	None	None.	None.	None.	\$500
None.	None	None	None.	None.	None.	None.	None.
23	2	2	1	4	1	3	6
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Both	No	Yes	Yes	Both	No	Yes	Yes
3	2	2	12	4	2	1	4
12	7	6	12	15	10	8	12
5	3	5	8	12	8	3	11
4	3	5	5	5	4	2	5
10	21	Unknown	2	4	2	5	27
No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
P.O.E.	Not Definite	P.O.E.	P.O.E.	Not Definite	Not Definite	Not Definite	P.O.E.
250	Not Definite	\$300	Not Definite	Not Definite	Not Definite	Not Definite	Not Definite
5¢	8¢	5¢	7½¢	7¢	7¢	6¢	—
—	None/8	None/9	None/9	None/9	None/8	—	—
All	\$1.25 P. Day	All	\$1.25 P. Meal	5¢ P. Meal	None	\$1 P. Day	\$2.50 P. Day
All	\$2 P. Day	All	\$1.25 P. Meal	\$1.25 P. Meal	None	\$1 P. Day	\$2.50 P. Day
—	None	All	\$1.25 P. Meal	None	None	\$1 P. Day	\$2.50 P. Day
All	All	All	All	All	None	—	All
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Yes	Yes	Yes	—	No	Yes	No	Yes
Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
equate.	Too lax	Adequate	Too lax	Adequate	Adequate	Adequate	Adequate
	✓	✓			✓		
	✓					✓	
		✓		✓	✓	✓	
				✓		✓	