

Aristotle for MBAs: Adapting Classical Rhetoric to Graduate Business Communication

**Mary Marcel
Bentley University**

The ability to effectively advocate for an important policy, product or position, to respond to tough questions effectively, and to identify and effectively convey potentially costly flaws in plans and designs—all these are vital for successful business professionals. Many graduate business programs offer some form of communication coursework, at varying levels of course credit; these may focus on effective presentations, managerial communication, business writing or other combinations of topics. Some programs now focus on leadership communication. Additionally, many business schools offer students the opportunity to participate in case competitions, which generally place them in situations which require quick thinking and flexibility. All these approaches point to several important criteria for graduate-level business communication instruction which may go beyond some traditional approaches.

Literature Review

Navarro (2008) wrote that, among the top fifty-ranked MBA programs in the US, 60% required a “management communications” course or module. He cited a 2002 AACSB study of MBA alumni, which concluded that “the most important predictor of business success is management effectiveness. However, while interpersonal skills, leadership, and communication are very important in shaping management effectiveness, they are some of the least effective skill sets taught in the typical MBA curriculum.” Other authors who have validated the importance of communication skill development among MBA and business graduate students include Cyphert (2002), Ulinski and Callaghan (2002), Sokuvitz (2002), Conrad and Newberry (2012), Javed (2012) and Hill, Mehta and Hynes (2014). Javed in particular, in reporting on a symposium on redesigning the MBA curriculum, noted that executives identified “the need for encouraging students to develop an accurate self-awareness that leads to good leadership skills..... Other traits that are required by executives are Interpersonal skills, critical thinking skills, decision making, communication skills, innovative thinking, ability to work under complex situations, adaptability to cope with change, global thinking, learning to work in a team and ethical behavior.” He further references a course taught in the Stanford University MBA program:

Stanford’s Critical Analytical Thinking Course (CAT) [is a] first-quarter course, [and] includes topics that have no right answers such as: Should K-12 education be publicly provided? publicly financed? or rules vs. discretion in the context of torture? in the context of key employee retention? But the “real” content is how to attack questions with basics of deductive/inductive arguments and causative and analogical reasoning. How do you reason and argue? How do you read/ listen critically? How do you present your arguments? (clarity and soundness rather than persuasion) Students are taught in the seminar format. It helps students infer, ask questions, be critical, and use logic and reasoning.

I concur with the author's choice of these skills for MBA students, and offer here an approach to teaching them in a compelling and transforming way.

Course Offerings and Development

Since 1992, my university has offered a range of courses addressing aspects of advanced oral communication at the graduate level. Many of you may have similar experiences in your graduate teaching and offerings, as priorities, enrollments and degree programs change. A graduate three-credit Effective Presentations course was a staple elective for the part-time and evening MBA program throughout the 1990s, with 3-4 sections of 24 seats offered each academic year. In the early 2000s a new, additional and required approach was taken for all MBA students, called the Professional Development Series, or PDS. It consisted of three five-week long, one-credit modules delivered sequentially during the same semester. One of the three was a dedicated Effective Presentation module, and was rated the most useful and recommended of the three by graduate students who took the series. Unfortunately, the other two modules were less well received and the course was eventually cancelled.

A second elective course, Managerial Communication, has focused on issues relating to addressing critical incidents, understanding psychological and cultural aspects of communication in organizational settings, teams, new manager issues, motivating and leading, electronic communication, and persuasion. It has been taught in both semester-long formats as well as one-week intensive formats. This course, however, has been taught even less frequently than Effective Presentations, given its limited demand as an elective.

These courses align with the aforementioned needs for MBA students to develop their interpersonal, group and leadership communication skills. In various ways, each course has given students the chance to develop critical thinking skills, but in a way somewhat incidental to the topic and content coverage of the course. The need for a site in which students can bring together a high level of analytical content with challenging preparation, team and delivery aspects was lacking. Likewise, students who have the opportunity to develop presentations which depend on visual aids like PowerPoint do not necessarily engage in the same level of critical analysis, verbal explanation and expression which a purely verbal presentation demands, in order to retain audience attention and build impact. Finally, it has been my impression that business students in general often lack development in constructive ways to critically respond to controversial or questionable proposals or even assumptions. The desire to quickly arrive at consensus, or to line up behind an influential leader, can be so great that poor decisions may be made with costly down-the-road consequences in time, resources, morale and competitiveness. At the MBA level, it is precisely these stumbling blocks which we are in an excellent position to address.

One approach taken by many top graduate business programs is to offer participation in case competitions. These contests give students multidimensional challenges—analysis, teamwork, presentation development, defense of their positions—and are regarded by many participants as a high point in their graduate experience. But a current survey underway with Dr. Nancy Mahon of the Penn State Smeal College of Business and me of the top 100 US MBA programs has revealed that few MBA programs require participation in such competitions. The elective competitions are also resource- and time-intensive, and afford benefits to small groups of students, at institutions which can afford either to pay for students to participate, or burden students with the cost of participation.

Course Design

Lecture Content

With these ideas in mind, the author created a three-credit course to develop graduate students' in-depth persuasive oral presentation and critical thinking skills for a variety of business situations. The intention was to bring a high level of rhetorical sophistication to students whose intellectual and psychological maturity levels demanded more than a straightforward foundational effective speaking course. The course was designed to include both individual and team presentations, and to utilize short-preparation formats, to develop students' strength in speaking extemporaneously, without visual aids or scripts. The course would offer rhetorical instruction, including lectures on audience analysis, standard analytical questions and procedures, organizational approaches to speeches, deductive and inductive reasoning and evidence, figurative language, avoidance of logical and rhetorical fallacies, deploying research in the moment, and adjusting messages for changing and more resistant audiences. But students would also make speeches frequently; in fact, in the five-day intensive format, each student makes at least one speech per day. So the in-depth development of rhetorical knowledge and techniques would be the morning's work, and the exercise of the day's teaching the work of the afternoon.

As a one-week intensive, students meet with the instructor for two hours approximately one month before the course begins. In this "pre-session," the structure of the course is explained; students briefly introduce themselves and state what they want to gain from the course. We then cover the basic elements of ethos, pathos and logos. Although, depending on the circumstances and audience, a predominantly emotional, logical or authority-based appeal may carry the day, it is easy to demonstrate to students that persuasion which combines the three elements of ethos, pathos and logos will likely result in a more durable and effective position. As such, we address, as ethos, the need to develop knowledge of one's subject, to demonstrate one's moral character, and to show good will toward one's audience. The latter can be construed both in terms of tone and in terms of the need to show mutual benefit in any message. We consider audiences and their emotional states, as pathos, as well as their psychological preferences in handling information and requests. For logos, we address two dimensions: how to build logically sound arguments both deductively and inductively; and word choice and the use of figures of speech.

And finally, we engage in some activities to set up the team debates, which will happen on the final day of class. I open the floor to suggestions for topics that can be debated in a problem-cause-solution format, and which are current. They need not be business-related; this is per student choice over the years. But they do need to be researchable, as each student is expected to produce a bibliography of twenty relevant articles on their topic prior to the first day of class. The range of topics over the years has included some political and social questions, like whether standardized testing in K-12 should be eliminated or euthanasia legalized, as well as business-oriented topics, like whether social media postings should be considered in hiring and firing, or whether a group of engineers whose disparate software products have been acquired by one company should accept their being brought under a common user interface. I take all the suggestions that will fit on the (physical) blackboard, and then students vote for their favorite. We go through as many rounds of voting (generally not more than three) to get to few enough topics so that debates will run between three and six people. Once the requisite number of topics has been arrived at, students self-sort into topic groups.

Before leaving the pre-session, they generate an agree-disagree version of their topic ("All American colleges and universities should offer MOOCs") which can be developed in a Problem-Cause-Solution format. Using BlackBoard as the course delivery system, each topic group gets a Discussion Board where the topic is posted. If the statement needs adjustment in order to be arguable, I offer the group suggestions and they make the final decision.

When the intensive week arrives, students attend class from 9-5 PM on five consecutive days. There is one assignment prepared prior to the course week, the research bibliography, and two after the week concludes. The structure of the course is morning lecture and afternoon speeches. Nevertheless, it could easily be adapted to a full-semester format. Class size in this format has been workable up to 28 students. The course has been successfully taught as a hybrid for the past ten years, using Saba Centra technology and a student assistant to handle technical issues. Online students are required to have a working microphone, camera function and Internet connection at all times during class hours.

One the first day, we focus on types of proof and learning how to quickly organize a speech. We discuss how to adapt Aristotelian rhetoric, which was designed to increase the persuasiveness as well as the likelihood of sound decisions in the law courts, the legislative body (Assembly), and on ceremonial occasions, to contemporary business settings. Forensic rhetoric, which addresses actions in the past and focuses on determining guilt and innocence, finds several modern business applications. When looking at company performance, we look back and analyze which drivers helped and which impeded performance. This may also include auditing, which analyzes and documents past performance with a view to providing a relevant and faithful representation of a company's financial position, and may call for adjustments and corrections. Crisis communication "lessons learned" require looking back and understanding how actions contributed to the crisis itself, as well as how various actions taken, communicative and otherwise, helped to address and resolve the problems that resulted. Third, there is the very clear matter of companies who find themselves faced with litigation or needing to litigate—a clear linkage to the forensic rhetorical framework.

While epideictic, or ceremonial, rhetoric may seem a distance away from business, when we look at its present time frame, its discussion of virtues and vices, and its means of praise and blame, we see some clear applications. Virtually all marketing falls under this heading—praising the qualities of one's own products and services while pointing out the shortcomings of the competition. This type of rhetoric also goes to mission statements, and even motivating employees to keep focus, take on new challenges, or prepare for changes in the organization, to cite a few examples. Finally, deliberative rhetoric, which addresses future time, and attempts to determine what is most expedient and avoid what is inexpedient, has perhaps the most ready applications in business. All business decisions, from product mix to marketing to budgeting to hiring—virtually all business decisions have future implications. This is why the model for the week is Problem-Cause-Solution, a deliberative model designed to help students develop their skills in the kind of persuasion they likely will be engaged in most often.

We then move to instruction in making deductive arguments, covering major premises, minor premises and conclusions. Next we apply these ideas to how we build a persuasive proposal for change. We discuss how to establishing the problem, in terms of its size and severity; the cause(s), which may be attitudinal (personal) or structural (organizational/corporate) and its inherency, referring to the barriers to change occurring without intentional action; and solutions, in terms of defining steps, addressing costs and financing, addressing possible flaws in workability and new disadvantages, and explaining benefits.

On the second day, lecture focuses on developing logical arguments and proof using induction. We also cover logical and psychological fallacies, and developing skills in arguing against proposals, by addressing problem, cause and solution in terms of the status quo. The problem (or opportunity) might not be as large or as serious as proponents claim; we explore what measures are relevant as opposed to simply available. Likewise, current efforts might be enough to resolve the issue; we can see the relevance to staffing, budget, an existing marketing campaign, etc. On cause, we explore alternate causalities, and whether attitudes may be so entrenched that desired change will not be feasible. Likewise, we discuss how some problems are self-limiting and self-resolving, and won't remain at issue over the near or longer term. Finally, on solution, we look at two major lines of argument: whether the proposed solution can work as explained, and whether it will usher in new disadvantages. Opportunity cost as well as straight financial cost can come into the frame here; but getting students to deploy what they know or can find out about the "workability" of a solution is equally valuable and satisfying for students.

On the third day, we shift to looking at ways to use language for greatest effect. We cover definitions and examples of thirty-five figures of speech (see Appendix A), and then read Martin Luther King Jr.'s speech "I Have a Dream," to see how figures can enhance and expand a message's persuasiveness. We reflect on how to shape arguments with respect to audience needs, beliefs, knowledge, politics, and hidden agendas. There is one additional two-hour meeting after dinner on Day Three, so that students can organize into Affirmative (arguing for the new proposal) and Negative (arguing against the proposal) sides and begin to prepare their arguments. On the fourth day, we look at how to connect with audiences. We consider Maslowe, Meyers-Briggs, traits, beliefs, psychology and personality types in a variety of professional fields. We discuss the "commonplaces" for business and the professions. And then we discuss the five-fold executive typology and recommended approaches to persuading each type in the 2002 *Harvard Business Review* article by Gary Williams and Robert Miller, "Change the Way You Persuade." The final day in class is entirely given over to debates.

Readings

Students are expected to complete all readings prior to the week of class. Each reading is discussed in the relevant lecture. Readings include Aristotle's *The Art of Rhetoric*; Ida B. Wells' speech "Southern Horrors," as an example of persuasion by induction; Martin Luther King Jr.'s "I Have A Dream" speech, as a text for the study of figurative language; and Williams and Miller's "Change the Way You Persuade" (*Harvard Business Review*, 2002), as an approach to understanding business executives' preferences in persuasion. Students are also given handouts prepared by the author (via BlackBoard) which define and give examples of figures of speech and rhetorical fallacies.

These readings, which reflect a mix of non-business and business sources, were chosen to stretch business students beyond the confines of case thinking, where right answers exist, and push them to develop ways to translate non-business rhetorical models into business contexts. By the same token, Williams and Miller present in my view an excellent research-based analysis of how to adapt the same message to five different kinds of executive audiences.

Assignments

The first two speeches are impromptu. Students have a total of seven minutes to prepare and then present; preparation excludes use of technology. On the first day, students choose Agree/Disagree topics based on current business questions. Students follow the seven-minute format. The following day, they present the opposite side of the position they took the day before. The idea is to force

students to find “the available means of persuasion”—the reasonable arguments on a side they may themselves disagree with. They are permitted to think about the topic overnight but are discouraged from engaging in research. On Day 2, there is a 15-minute period of preparation time for all, and then all are given up to seven minutes to present this opposite-side argument.

For the third day, students decide on two serious and two humorous topics the day before. These topics are then debated in a parliamentary style, where students speak for up to three minutes on a pro, con, pro, con basis, until they agree the topic has been exhausted. One student volunteers to be the “lead off” speaker for either the pro or the con for each topic. The objective is for students to utilize (and correctly identify) at least two distinct figures of speech in their own speeches, and point out two different fallacies in others’ speeches by day’s end.

For the fourth day, students draw topics comprised of short quotations about business and business practices. They return to the impromptu format from Day One. On the fifth day, students debate proposals for change which they voted on and self-selected into groups for during the pre-session. The debates follow a traditional forensic format, and include cross examination (Appendix B). The idea is not that students will engage in such formatted debates in their careers; rather, it is an exercise in critical thinking and the ability to marshal research prepared ahead of time in the moment of being asked or challenged to defend the proposal (or the status quo). The debate also forces students to develop their arguments in response to what the other side has said, so that the process is more like real-world persuasion—not a one-off performance that is either up or down.

In addition to their graded individual speeches and the debate, students prepare three assignments apart from the week of class. A bibliography of at least 20 articles on both sides of their agreed-upon debate topics is due from each student three days before class begins. These articles form the basis of their evidence for the debate. One month after the class ends, students submit a 2-3 page audience analysis paper, which describes how they would alter a previous presentation (from in or out of class) for a more resistant audience. Students frequently revisit a presentation that they made in the past that didn’t go terribly well, or one that did succeed but which now must be given to a more challenging audience. A second paper takes one of their own speeches and re-writes it, to incorporate fifteen different figures of speech. This assignment helps students develop a greater sense of play with language, and to start to see how figures can enhance their messages with a variety of associative, syntactic, logical, and sound effects.

Challenges and Opportunities for Instructors and Students

As with any intensive-format course, time and timely deliverables are of the essence. This course combines a rigorous critical thinking curriculum with a performative course. Thus students are depending on feedback to improve each day. In the one-week format, the instructor turns around comments and grades on speeches for Days One, Two and Four in real time—for example, students get their Day One comments on the morning of Day Two latest (Day Three is graded on a completion basis). I provide students with a completed grading rubric and my comments, along with a copy of my notes on their speeches. I have a short commute and efficient work processes for this course, but it is demanding even under the best circumstances. On the positive side, the use of synchronous hybrid technology has enabled students to not miss class because of bad weather, and also elect to connect from home when saving commuting time is advantageous.

Students are sometimes a bit daunted initially by the impromptu format. But because the course is a very immersive experience, and every presentation assignment is covered ahead of time in class, students can see the improvements they make from day to day. In other research (Marcel, 2015; forthcoming) I found a direct and significant correlation between frequency of presenting, reductions in communication anxiety and increased levels of self-perceived confidence in making presentations. It has been my experience that even students who are relatively anxious at the beginning of the week finish Day Five with a genuine sense of accomplishment, because they have completed between six and eight presentations, generally, over the course of five days—presentations which they composed largely in the moment and delivered with insufficient time to second-guess themselves, over-think, or practice. We frequently see descriptions and discussions of experiential education in business school contexts. While this course does not involve case per se, live or otherwise, it does raise the stakes for students, who each must perform a roster of challenging speeches in a pressurized setting. And while students tend not to rate the class among their most difficult, they consistently indicate in Student Evaluations of Teaching that they have benefitted from the course to a high degree and would recommend it to others.

Takeaways/Outcomes

Students gain experience in critical analysis, thinking on their feet, preparing a coordinated set of strategies for a team position defense, and creating effective individual persuasive presentations. The steep learning curve and intensive nature help students quickly move past their anxiety and learn to focus on the message and audience. The course has earned very high student evaluations in every semester it has been taught (approximately 20 times since 1995).

References

- Conrad, D. and Newberry, R. (2012). Identification and instruction of important business communication skills for graduate business education. *Journal of Education for Business*, 87, 112–120.
- Cyphert, D. (2002). Integrating communication across the MBA curriculum. *Business Communication Quarterly*, 65(3), 81-86.
- Javed, S. (2012). Redesigning the MBA: A curriculum development symposium. *Pakistan Business Review*, 13(4), 793-804.
- Hill, K., Mehta, G., and Hynes, G. (2014). Do they think they can communicate? Graduate students' perceptions of their communication competencies. *Journal of Organizational Culture, Communications and Conflict*, 18(1), 275-286.
- Marcel, M. (2015). What's the best course? Evidence from alumni on the value of business presentations preparation. *Journal of Education for Business* 90(1), 10-17.
- Navarro, P. (2008). The MBA core curricula of top-ranked U.S. business schools: A study in failure? *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 7(1), 108–123.
- Sokuvitz, S. (2002). Global business communication: The design and delivery of MBA instruction. *Business Communication Quarterly*, 65(1), 56-69.
- Ulinski, M., & O'Callaghan, S. (2002). A comparison of MBA students' and employers' perceptions of the value of oral communication skills for employment. *Journal of Education for Business*, 77, 193-197.
- Williams, G. and Miller, R. (2002). Change the way you persuade. *Harvard Business Review*, 80(5), 64-73, 133.

MARY MARCEL is Assistant Professor of Information Design and Corporate Communication at Bentley University. Her research on alumni reflections on their presentation skills development is published in the *Journal of Education for Business*. Her current research focuses on communication anxiety among undergraduates and across the career span, and on graduate case competitions.

Appendix A
Figures of Speech
Compiled by Mary Marcel

TROPES

Metaphor: A word or phrase denoting one kind of object or action is used in place of another to suggest a likeness or analogy between them; an implied comparison. C

Ships *plow* the deep. Internet users *surf* the *Web*.
This car is a *lemon*.
Hawks and Doves
Bulls and Bears

Analogy An extended or elaborate comparison between two things or situations. C

MLK Jr.: The people have come to cash a check.

Simile An explicit comparison using *like* or *as*. C

My love is like a red, red rose
That blooms again in June. Robert Burns

Metonymy Substitution of a word for a related word, such as cause and effect, or container for the thing contained. B

Wall Street, the *White House*, the *Pentagon*, *10 Downing Street*, *Buckingham Palace*, *Windsor Castle*, the *Kremlin*, *Silicon Valley*
the *suits*, the *skirts*, *boots* on the ground, the *brass*
The Deep for the ocean
Bank for money ("Good Will Hunting"): "making good bank"
Java for coffee; *China* for dishes; *silver* for silverware; *glasses* for eyeglasses
hottie for an attractive person; *kicks* for athletic shoes

Synecdoche Substitution of a part for the whole. B

wheels for cars, as in Hot Wheels
Jaws, for a movie about sharks
All *hands* on deck!
Butts in the seats
Eyeballs on the screen

Irony Figure in which the intended implication or meaning is the opposite of the literal sense of the words. C

Hyperbole Extravagant exaggeration that represents something as much greater or less, better or worse, or more intense than it really is or that depicts the impossible as actual. C

I'm so hungry I could eat a cow.
He's so mad he's gonna explode.

Litotes Understatement in which an affirmative is expressed by the negative of the contrary. C

He's not a bad player.

FIGURES OF ARRANGEMENT

Gradatio Description of a sequence of actions or positions, often with the repetition of key words from one phrase to the next. A "step figure," which moves from one level of abstraction to another, or through time. Usually arouses the audience's expanding emotions. A

*First they came for the Socialists, and I did not speak out--
Because I was not a Socialist.*

*Then they came for the Trade Unionists, and I did not speak out--
Because I was not a Trade Unionist.*

*Then they came for the Jews, and I did not speak out--
Because I was not a Jew.*

Then they came for me--and there was no one left to speak for me.
--Martin Niemöller, Protestant pastor

Auxesis Arrangement in ascending importance. B

Catalogue A list of things that belong to the same general, often unstated category. This becomes useful when one controversial element is inserted into the catalogue. It suggests that the parallel grammatical structure establishes a parallel logical structure. A

Anaphora Deliberate repetition of a phrase at the beginning of several successive clauses, paragraphs or verses

Anadiplosis "Repetition of an end at the next beginning: 'When I give, I give myself.'" B

Epanados "Repetition in the opposite order: 'Fair is foul, and foul is fair.'" B

Epanalepsis "Repetition of the beginning at the end: 'Common sense is not so common.'" B

Epistrophe	<p>"Repetition of ends" B</p> <p>"When I was a child, I spake as a child, I understood as a child, I thought as a child."</p> <p><i>It was the best of times; it was the worst of times.</i> -- <u>A Tale of Two Cities</u></p>
Isocolon	<p>"Repetition of grammatical forms" B</p> <p>"The bigger the come, the harder they fall."</p>
Antanaclasis	<p>Repetition of the same word in various senses B</p> <p><i>Classic styles that never go out of style.</i> – L. L. Bean</p> <p><i>It's nice to be nice to the nice.</i> – Frank Burns, M*A*S*H</p>
Polyptoton	<p>"Repetition of the same word or root in different grammatical functions or forms: 'Few men speak humbly of humility.'" B</p> <p><i>In order to comfort the afflicted, you must afflict the comfortable.</i> Princess Diana</p>
Asyndeton	<p>Omitting conjunctions: "I came, I saw, I conquered." B</p> <p>Work hard, play hard.</p>

FIGURES USING LOGIC

Allusion	A figurative or symbolic reference; implied indication; indirect reference. C
Antithesis	<p>Repetition by negation. B</p> <p><i>Ask not what your country can do for you. Ask what you can do for your country.</i></p> <p><i>It's not the size of the dog in the fight; it's the size of the fight in the dog.</i></p> <p><i>Not everything that counts can be counted; and not everything that can be counted, counts.</i> Albert Einstein</p>
Controversia	Giving the pro and the con. A
Contrarium	<p>Comparison of two situations, arguing that if the less probable situation is true, so the more probable situation must also be true. A</p>
Correctio	<p>Modification of what has just been said by the insertion of a more fitting expression. Emphasizes the grace of the expression and makes it more fitting, by stopping the flow of the sentence to focus on the word itself. Also makes the speaker seem more precise and careful. A</p>
Definition	<p>Statement of the characteristic qualities of a thing or idea. The speaker design the definition with a specific set of values in mind. A</p>
Example	<p>Citing a specific instance from the past. This makes the thought more vivid and concrete.</p>

Exemplum	Direct quotation. A
Expeditio	Working through all the possible explanations or options, and eliminating all but one. A
Praeteritio	Saying what you say you are not going to say; “including something by pretending to refuse to say it.” A
Prolepsis	It would be unkind to call him a failure, or to say that she isn’t very smart. “Anticipatory refutation of the opposition’s arguments.” A
Sententia	“Pithy saying or phrase that seems to have a generally accepted weight” with a particular audience. A <i>You can fool some of the people all of the time, and all of the people some of the time. But you can’t fool all of the people all of the time.</i> –Abraham Lincoln
Apostrophe	Turning to address another audience or a single person not present. A

FIGURES INVOLVING SOUND

Assonance	“Repetition of similar vowel sounds, preceded and followed by different consonants, in the stressed syllables of adjacent words.” D <i>Add and subtract; credits and debits; log on; log off</i>
Alliteration	“Repetition of initial or medial consonants in two or more adjacent words.” D <i>Rinse and repeat; bulls and bears; fight or flight; hip hop; cash and carry; decimal dust; deep dive</i>

A: Adrienne Miller, *Exercises in Persuasion*

B: Arthur Quinn, *Figures of Speech*

C: *Webster’s Third New International Dictionary*

D: Edward J. Corbett, *Classical Rhetoric for the Modern Student*, 2nd ed.

Appendix B Debate Formats

For Four: Each side has two speakers. Affirmatives argue for change. Negatives argue against change. P = problem; C = cause; S = solution.

Position	Covers	Mins
First affirmative	P, C, S	8
Cross ex of 1 st Aff by 2 nd neg	Questions about P/C/S	3
First negative	Attacks P, C	8
Cross ex of 1 st neg by 1 st Aff	Questions about P, C	3
Second affirmative	Responds to attacks on P, C	8
Cross ex of 2 nd Aff by 1 st neg	Questions about P, C	3
Second negative	Attacks solution	8
Cross ex of 2 nd neg by 2 nd Aff	Questions about S	3
First negative rebuttal	Responds to 2 nd aff on P, C	4
First affirmative rebuttal	Responds to 2 nd neg on S	4
Second negative rebuttal	Responds to 1 st aff & wraps up neg arguments	4
Second affirmative rebuttal	Responds to 2 nd neg & wraps up aff arguments	4

For Two: Each side has one speaker. Affirmative argues for change. Negative argues against change.

Position	Covers	Mins
Affirmative	P, C, S	8
Cross ex of Aff by Neg	Questions about P/C/S	2
Negative	Attacks P, C	6
Cross ex of Neg by Aff	Questions about P, C	2
Affirmative	Responds to attacks on P, C	4

Cross ex of Aff by Neg	Questions about P, C	2
Negative	Attacks solution	6
Cross ex of Neg by Aff	Questions about S	2
Negative rebuttal	Responds to Aff on P, C	3
Affirmative rebuttal	Responds to Neg on S	3
Negative rebuttal	Responds to Aff & wraps up Neg arguments	3
Affirmative rebuttal	Responds to Neg & wraps up Aff arguments	3

For Three: There are two Affirmatives arguing for two different proposals for change. Negative argue against both proposals.

Position	Covers	Time
First Affirmative	Problem, Cause, Solution	8 min
Cross-Examination by Second Aff	Anything brought up by 1 st aff	3 min
Negative	Responds to P, C, S from 1 st aff	8 min
Cross-Examination by First Aff		3 min
Second Aff	A different version of P, C, S: less radical change called for than 1 st aff	8 min
Cross-Examination by Negative	Anything brought up by 2nd aff	3 min
Negative	Responds to P, C, S from 2nd aff	8 min
Second Aff rebuttal	Responds to attacks from Neg and sums up his overall position	4 min
Negative rebuttal	Responds to 2AR and summarizes his overall position	4 min
First Aff rebuttal	Responds to Negative attacks and summarizes his overall position	4 min

**For Five:
If Three Aff, Two Neg:**

Position	Covers	Mins
First affirmative	P, C, S	12
Cross ex of 1 st Aff by 2 nd Neg	Questions about P/C/S	2
First negative	Attacks P, C	12
Cross ex of 1 st Neg by 1 st Aff	Questions about P, C	2
Second affirmative	Responds to attacks on P, C	12
Cross ex of 2 nd Aff by 1 st Neg	Questions about P, C	2
Second negative	Attacks solution	12
Cross ex of 2 nd Neg by 2 nd Aff	Questions about S	2
First negative rebuttal	Responds to 2 nd aff on P, C	6
Third affirmative rebuttal	Responds to 2 nd neg on S	6
Second negative rebuttal	Responds to 3 rd aff & wraps up neg arguments	6
Third affirmative rebuttal	Responds to 2 nd neg & wraps up aff arguments	6

If Two Aff, Three Neg:

Position	Covers	Mins
First affirmative	P, C, S	12
Cross ex of 1 st Aff by 2 nd neg	Questions about P/C/S	2
First negative	Attacks P, C	12
Cross ex of 1 st neg by 1 st aff	Questions about P, C	2
Second affirmative	Responds to attacks on P, C	12
Cross ex of 2 nd Aff by 1 st neg	Questions about P, C	2
Second negative	Attacks solution	12
Cross ex of 2 nd neg by 2 nd aff	Questions about S	2

Third negative rebuttal	Responds to 2 nd aff on P, C	6
First affirmative rebuttal	Responds to 2 nd neg on S	6
Third negative rebuttal	Responds to 1st aff & wraps up neg arguments	6
Second affirmative rebuttal	Responds to 3rd neg & wraps up aff arguments	6

For Six

Position	Covers	Mins
First affirmative	P, C, S	11
Cross ex of 1 st Aff by 2 nd neg	Questions about P/C/S	3
First negative	Attacks P, C	11
Cross ex of 1 st neg by 1 st Aff	Questions about P, C	3
Second affirmative	Responds to attacks on P, C	11
Cross ex of 2 nd Aff by 1 st neg	Questions about P, C	3
Second negative	Attacks solution	11
Cross ex of 2 nd neg by 2 nd Aff	Questions about S	3
Third negative rebuttal I	Responds to 2 nd aff on P, C	6
Third affirmative rebuttal I	Responds to 2 nd neg on S	6
Third negative rebuttal II	Responds to Third Aff Rebuttal I & wraps up neg arguments	6
Third affirmative rebuttal II	Responds to Third Neg Rebuttal II & wraps up aff arguments	6