

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS

CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS

CONFERENCE PAPERS

Perspectives of a Forensic Coach's First Year
Nancy Anderson Haga
Longwood College

What the Rules Mean: Using Defined Judging Guidelines to Augment
Informal Training
J.G. Harrington
Dow, Lohnes & Albertson (Washington, D.C.)

Helping the Inexperienced Director
Alice J. Jaswal, Ph.D.
Nebraska Wesleyan University

What I Think You Should Do Is. . .
Joel L. Hefling
South Dakota State University

Implications of the Informal Training of Coaches and Judges
Robert L. Davenport
University of Montevallo

Strategic Recruitment
Keith Denslow
University of Nebraska

When We Don't Know How to Get Where We're Going. . .
Perhaps It's Time We Find a Map
Sharon Porter, Ph.D.
Northern Arizona University

Mentoring Relationships and Programs: Applications to the
Forensics Community
Cynthia R. Carver and Cindy Larson-Casselton
Concordia College

A Question of Oral Questions: Why Aren't Judges Allowed to
Query Competitors?
Erik T. Kanter
San Diego State University

Inter-Judge Agreement: An Analysis of the 1990 NFA and AFA-NIET
National Individual Events Tournaments
Jon C. Bruscke
University of Utah
K. Jeanine Congalton and Robert H. Gass
California State University, Fullerton

Telling the Story of the Informally Trained Coach/Judge
Colan T. Hanson, Ph.D.
North Dakota State University

Community College Programs: How Have the AFA Nationals Affected
This Population?
Mike Wartman
Normandale Community College

National Individual Events Tournament Qualifying Legs: An Idea
Whose Time Has Passed
Clark D. Olson
Arizona State University

Appendix:

The Ethical Use of Evidence in Public Address Events
Sheryl A. Friedley
George Mason University

A Value Approach: Some Notes Toward the Educational/Competitive
Aspects of Forensic Programs
Jan J. Younger
Heidelberg College

Imitation is the Most Sincere Form of Flattery, But It's Not the
Most Educational Form of Forensics
Roger C. Aden
University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire

Lending a Helping Hand: Some Suggestions for "Common Sense
Meddling"
James K. Dittus
University of Nebraska-Lincoln

CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS

Through-out the weekend, several different groups met to discuss the "state of Individual Events" and offer suggestions for the future. Each group developed a list of resolutions which was presented to the entire body at the end of the Conference. Since this group was not a legislative body, the resolutions were not presented as motions for voting; instead, they were offered as suggestions for the Forensic community. During the final session of the Developmental Conference on Individual Events, the following resolutions were endorsed by the participants in attendance.

NEW PROGRAMS

1. That the COFO Directory identify experienced forensic educators to serve as mentors to new directors.
2. That a workshop to provide training for Directors Forensics in all areas of program administration to be held on June 16-22, 1991.
3. That tournament directors develop apprentice programs designed to provide experience in tournament administration.
4. That tournament directors should recognize novice competitors through special divisions and/or awards at the regional level.
5. That tournament directors provide opportunities for social interaction between students and forensic educators.
6. That national tournaments offer special "Newcomer Awards" for schools competing at the tournament for the first time.
7. That forensics journals focus special issues on basic program operation including program administration, selecting tournaments, gaining publicity and/or methods of recruitment and retention especially of "at risk" students.
8. That new Directors of Forensics seek information from employers regarding their legal responsibilities and liabilities when traveling with students on forensic trips.
9. That a video recruitment tape be planned and produced.

ORAL INTERPRETATION

1. We encourage all national tournament committees to employ descriptive rationale for each of the national events.
2. We urge that the national organizations draft ethics statements in support of the literary integrity considering such issues including, but not limited to: writing in

characters, altering plot lines, rewriting lines or parts of a story, altering verb tenses.

3. We encourage national organizations to require that students and/or coaches are able to produce uncut, contiguous sections of the original source performed.
4. We encourage coaches to teach and work with students on the process of cutting literature.
5. We encourage coaches and students to emphasize the educational process of literary criticism.
6. We urge students and coaches to engage in a high level of analysis in their choices of literature, introductions, transitions, and audience.
7. We encourage tournament directors who write invitations to follow the recommendations generated at the National Developmental Conferences of 1984, 1988, and 1990.
8. We support a justified, quality performance that grows out of the literature and makes the literature come alive. We support consideration of the following, including but not limited to, for example: Manuscript-optional, use of visual aids, the interweaving of literature, creative movement, etc.
9. We recommend national organizations request justification for rank and rate ideally in the form of "Reason for Decisions" on ballots.
10. We recommend instructors and students seek out interdisciplinary sources for wider literary choices.
11. We recommend that the forensic community design a certification program for future consideration.
12. We strongly encourage tournament directors to train hired judges for tournaments.

PUBLIC SPEAKING

1. Tournament directors are strongly encouraged to include a question/answer period by another contestant in finals and/or preliminary rounds of public address events.
2. To support the creation of a contestant's guidebook on ethical practices for both interpretive and original speaking events. The guidebook should include, but not be limited to, issues of plagiarism, proper source citation, author integrity, and literary integrity, as well as all codes of ethics currently published by all national forensics organizations. We propose that the guidebook

include definitions, rationales for ethical models, and illustrative material.

3. That forensics organizations be responsible for distributing their codes of ethics to all competitors prior to their respective national tournaments.
4. With increasing use of personal interviews for gathering information, we recommend that both coaches and students consider the implications of using these valid sources, and that interviews used as resource material be electronically recorded and made available upon request.
5. Tournament directors inform and encourage judges to set aside personal opinions regarding subject matter in public address events.
6. Tournament directors inform and encourage judges to set aside personal opinions regarding organizational patterns (e.g. problem-solution) in public address events.
7. Tournament directors are encouraged to experiment with providing general audience parameters for persuasive speaking.
8. Originality as a criterion be more clearly defined to mean original work and subject treatment rather than the use of unique and unusual topics.
9. Public address events should be evaluated primarily on the basis of content and rhetorical style rather than delivery.
10. To encourage forensics directors, coaches, students, and judges to select materials and events which maximize the educational experience of the contestants by demanding mastery of a variety of skills unique to each event.
11. We encourage forensics directors, coaches, and students to explore and utilize multiple topics each season in each event as a tool to practice basic skills of public speaking.
12. Directors of tournaments offering public address events should provide opportunities for thoughtful criticism of student performance.
13. Public address event rules should be modified to clearly state expectations for student performance.
14. Tournament directors who adopt experimental rules or procedures should take steps to evaluate these efforts formally and report the results of the evaluations to the forensic community through appropriate channels.

TRAINING PRACTICES

1. That a formal mentoring program, tied to a parent organization be established to service the developmental needs of new and existing coaches.
2. That formal training programs for judges should include, but not be limited to: explanation of rules, principles of events, criteria for writing constructive ballots, judging etiquette, and sample ballots.
3. That tournament directors should provide substantive guidelines for performances in each event at their tournament. National tournament organizations are especially encouraged to do so.
4. That tournament directors should assume responsibility for monitoring the professional performance of their hired judges.
5. That individual events ballots should include specific sections for explanation of the rationale behind the judge's decision.
6. That in conformance with the principles of Resolution 48 of the Second Developmental Conference on Forensics (Evanston) tournament directors should consider allowing time for additional oral critiques following the conclusion of a round.
7. That workshops be encouraged to examine the norms, skills, and legitimacy of forensic scholarship.
8. That individual tournament directors should provide limited time, to the extent possible, for judges to informally ask questions at the end of a student's performance.
9. That the COFO sponsor programs on insuring the long-term financial stability of forensics.
10. That college forensic programs, in cooperation with high school organizations, should encourage their students to participate in formal judge training procedures to include judging high school contests.

HIERARCHY

1. To create a committee to investigate the creation of a national forensic office to act as a non-policy, coordinating body for forensic organizations. This committee will be charged with determining the duties of this office including internal and external public relations, enactment, and potential methods of funding.
2. That this body express dissatisfaction with the current at-large method of qualification for the AFA-NIET and encourage

them to explore practical alternatives.

3. To encourage the AFA-NIET to eliminate the at-large "leg" qualification procedures and replace them with a double district system.
4. That the AFA-NIET be encouraged to modify its at-large qualification method to allow students to qualify by obtaining a cumulative of "9" rankings over 3 tournaments regardless of the size of the tournament.
5. To encourage the development and tournament sponsorship of experimental and creative events.
6. To minimize and eliminate the verbal emphasis on national tournament qualification information at tournament announcements.
7. That tournaments whose purpose is to manipulate competition to increase qualification for the national tournaments in I.E. are unethical.
8. To encourage the AFA to divest itself of the national tournaments (NDT/NIET) in order to become the umbrella organization of the forensic community.
9. To encourage the AFA to explore means to make Argument and Advocacy: Jafa more responsive to the needs and interests of the entire forensics community.
10. That on or before June 1, 1991, each forensic organization endorse the AFA as the umbrella organization of the forensic community if the AFA divest itself of the NDT and NIET.
11. That the AFA and/or the COFO assume the functions of the SCA Forensic Division.
12. That the SCA Forensic Division no longer be an officer of COFO.

EDUCATIONAL/COMPETITIVE DUALITY

1. To endorse the role of competition in enhancing education.
2. To encourage program directors to include more egalitarian experiences for students. Forensic directors should seek a variety of forums for students, and those forums should serve a variety of students' experience levels.
3. That forensic coaches have the duty to articulate to students their program's philosophy, goals, rules, and expectations.
4. That tournament directors present both event rules and educational outcomes as event descriptions in tournament

invitations.

5. That individual tournament directors engage in experimentation that fosters educational outcomes in rounds of competition. Such experimentation includes, but is not limited to, question-answer periods, diversity in performance venue, oral critiquing, and decision rationales.

6. That academic departments of Speech Communication institute courses and/or workshops in forensic pedagogy for future forensic educators at the undergraduate and graduate levels.

7. That a national office be established to promote and publicize forensic activity.

8. That this body recognize the critical need to publicize and promote the educational benefits of forensics within the Speech Communication profession and to the larger public.

CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS

Arizona State Univ.
CLARK OLSON

Bradley University
GARY DREIBELBIS

Cal-State Univ. - Fullerton
K. JEANINE CONGALTON

Central Missouri State Univ.
W. CLIFTON ADAMS & E. SAM COX

Colorado Christian Univ.
DWIGHT PODURSKI

Concordia College
CYNTHIA CARVER & CINDY L. CASSELTON

Dow, Lohnes & Albertson
J. G. HARRINGTON

Florida State University
MARY CUBBEDGE & RANDY GOODMAN

George Mason Univ.
SHERYL FREIDLEY & BRUCE MANCHESTER

St. Petersburg Jr. Col.-Clearwater
BONNIE CLARK

S.H.M.S.
JODENE WARTMAN

South Dakota State Univ.
JOEL HEFLING

Southern Connecticut State Univ.
SETH HAWKINS

Troy State University
CHERYL FORBES

University of Chicago
KRISTEN W. ALBRECHT

Univ. Of Montevallo
ROBERT L. DAVENPORT

Boston College
DALE HERBECK

Brevard Community College
BARBARA WILLIAMS

Carson-Newman College
EDDIE MYERS

Chadron State College
CAROL HALLEY

Colorado State Univ.
MARY RYAN

Cornell University
LEISEL REINHART

East Central Univ.
ROBERT GREENSTREET

Heidelberg College
JAN YOUNGER

St. Cloud State Univ.
DAVID WARNE

San Diego State Univ.
ERIK KANTERS-CRAIG SCOTT

Shepherd College
CHARLES MCGEEVER

Southeastern Illinois
GARY ALLEN - JONAH RICE
GEORGE DENNIS

Suffolk University
ED HARRIS & VICKI KARNS

U.S. Air Force Academy
MICHAEL DALEY, ELISE ROWE
GWENDOLYN FAYNE, BRIAN
HUBBARD, GREGORY RUSSEL

U. of Missouri-St.Louis
SCOTT JENSEN &
C. THOMAS PRESTON

Georgetown Univ.
MARGARET GREYNOLDS

Illinois State Univ.
MICHAEL KIRCH

Longwood College
NANCY A. HAGA

Mankato State Univ.
LINDA BORNHOLT, SCOTT DICKMEYER
GRACE GULLETTE, MIKE MAGUIRE
NICOLE OWREN, JANELLE WALDOCK
LARRY SCHNOOR

Moorehead State Univ.
BRYANT ALEXANDER & MARTY BIRKHOLT

Normandale Community College
REX GASKILL & MIKE WARTMAN

North Dakota State Univ.
C. T. HANSON

Otterbein College
CHRIS REYNOLDS

Univ. of Nebraska-Lincoln
KEITH DENSLOW, JIM DITTUS
JACK KAY, DAN MILLS, ANN PETTUS
SUSANNE WILLIAMS

Univ. of Southern Maine
WALTER K. STUMP

Univ. of Wisconsin - River Falls
JIM PRATT

Youngstown State College
DAVID J. ROBINSON

Iowa State University
MICHAEL KIRCH

Manchester College
LARRY UNDERWOOD

Marshall University
JERRY BLUHM

Minnetonka High School
BRIAN A. HALLEEN

Nebraska Wesleyan
ALICE JASWAL

Northern Arizona Univ.
SHARON PORTER

Northern Iowa State
BRUCE WICKELGRIN

Regis College
VICKY BRADFORD

Univ. of S. Colorado
M. ARNZEN, J. FARMER
SHAWNALEE WHITNEY

U. Wisconsin-Eau Claire
ROGER ADEN

Western Washington Univ.
DON K. SWANSON

Perspectives of a Forensic Coach's First Year

Nancy Anderson Haga
Longwood College (VA)

"You want me to do what?" I stammered as I faced our new college president. During his undergraduate days at Baylor University, he had been a stand-out in extemporaneous speaking. When Dr. William Dorrill arrived at Longwood College, one of his top priorities was starting a forensic team.

"Congratulations, Nancy. You are the new forensic coach." That is precisely how I landed the job. Serving as chairman of the Department of Speech and Theatre and as a freshman seminar leader, I was already loaded with responsibilities. But into an already busy schedule starting a forensic team was added.

Geographically, Longwood College is located in the center of the state of Virginia. Only George Mason, American University and Howard University had competitive programs and were situated three hours away from us.

In 1983, Grace Walsh wrote an article in the *Journal of the Wisconsin Communication Association* entitled "Reflections on Forensics." Based on her forty-eight years of coaching experience, Walsh offered fifteen criteria for a successful program:

1. The teacher must be well prepared.
2. The school system should be supportive of the program.
3. The community should see positive proof of the worth of the program.
4. The press should publicize the program.
5. Parents should be informed about school activities.

6. College squads should fight for the annual budget.
7. Some kind of club organization is highly recommended.
8. All events on the schedule should challenge students to perform with those of comparable expertise (beginners, intermediate and advanced).
9. Other faculty members should constantly be informed about new events.
10. Freshmen counselors can set up questionnaires to screen the list of incoming students who have previous experience.
11. The emergence of organized area leagues should occur.
12. Colleges and universities should sponsor clinics, festivals, tournaments and summer programs.
13. Invite community experts in areas related to the debate proposition to come in as guest lecturers.
14. Keep your alumni active in the program.
15. The final feeling of the student should be his conviction that this experience has been worth the effort.¹

When we assessed Longwood College's potential to start a forensic program, we had eight of the fifteen points in place.

We had a supportive college and community, a budget out of the president's office, an informed faculty, a summer program for high school coaches, an invitational debate and forensic tournament for high schools, a competent public relations office, the conviction that it was a worthwhile program, and an established forensic/debate reputation on the state level with the Virginia High School League.

In sorting through the other seven criteria, special emphasis was placed on the eleventh standard: starting an organized area league. Deciding that we needed

¹Walsh, Grace. "Reflections on Forensics," *Journal of the Wisconsin Communication Association*, paper presented at the Eastern Communication Association (Providence, RI: May 2-5, 1985), pp. 45-47.

some experience that was not as competitive, structured or intense as our northern Virginia colleagues, we contacted four colleges within an hour of Farmville. In a preliminary meeting, we started the Central Virginia Forensic League. With suggestions and encouragement from Bruce Manchester and Sheryl Friedly of George Mason, we adopted the rules established by the American Forensic Association. We opted for three, one-day tournaments with three rounds and a final round in seven individual events. We persuaded our individual schools to finance one tournament. To break the ice, Longwood hosted the first tournament in December 1988 with more than 40 students from three colleges. Lynchburg College handled the second tournament in January, with Randolph-Macon Women's College hosting the last tournament in March. The fourth college, Hampden-Sydney, dropped out of the league.

When the district tournament of the American Forensic Association was scheduled at George Mason in the same March, our college was the only one with enough courage to enter the competition. At the end of the first round, we knew that we were outclassed, outpracticed, and amateurs in the professional arena. But Bruce Manchester and Sheryl Friedly were sensitive to our inexperience and encouraged and reassured us. When the meet was over, we had three students who made the finals and qualified for a national tournament. Needless to say, our president was ecstatic. Hence, Longwood College was initiated into the intercollegiate forensic arena. When the faculty/coaches of Lynchburg College and Randolph-Macon Women's College accepted other employment, their programs folded. Thus, we were the only survivors of the Central Virginia Speech League.

When school opened for the 1989-90 year, President Dorrill provided a small budget out of his office for our entrance into five tournaments. In addition, he promised extra money if any of our students qualified for national competition.

Reflecting over this past year, I want to address several frustrating issues. The thesis for this paper will address three areas: 1) the faculty/coach problems, 2) the student problems, and 3) the logistical problems.

In Grace Walsh's criteria, her first emphasis was on the presentation of the teacher. My lack of training was evident. Most of the coaches of college teams have actively participated in forensics as undergraduates. When searching for a university or college that offered a summer workshop for college coaches, none were available. In fact, my institution was willing to send me for additional training, but most of the programs were designed for high school students and coaches.

Time became the next problem. Finding enough hours in the week to teach, to prepare for classes, to grade papers, to carry out administrative jobs, to attend meetings, and to coach students became a frustration.

Thomas Meulemans presented a paper on May 1, 1988 at the Eastern Communication Association meeting in Atlantic City, New Jersey. He stated that "Forensic programs generally take too much time and energy from other work, and an inordinate amount of our relaxation and recharge time. We recruit, raise money, plan the itineraries, host tournaments, manage budgets, fight the rest of the staff and administrators to keep what little perks we have, and try to keep our debaters from pulling each other's hair out. We mark exams and essays in the back of hotel bars and figure out grades on all-night buses, mailing them back to school from cities passed through on a Greyhound bus en route to national finals."²

When Robert Littlefield of North Dakota State University surveyed over one hundred college coaches as to their concerns, three general subject areas emerged: time, content and commitment. The respondents identified the time problem as

²Meulemas, Thomas. "Precautions in Applying Forensic Experience to Classroom Practices," paper presented at the Eastern Communication Association (Atlantic City, NJ: April 30-May 3, 1988), p. 2.

needing more time to coach, more time to recruit, more time for practice, and finding a common time for team meetings.³

From my perspective, the lack of training for my coaching and the demands on my time were barriers that needed to be addressed if I were to continue in this capacity as a coach.

The second type of problem was student-oriented. Since Longwood College is a small, liberal arts school, our student population is usually involved in two or three extracurricular activities. Most of our competitors in interpretation events were theatre majors. Since working on mainstage plays was a requirement in their majors, these students were not available during technical and production weeks. Rivalry for time by other activities became a real problem for our team.

Student motivation was another key factor. When starting a program, little success is realized in the beginning. The competition was so keen that new students often felt overwhelmed. For some, it served as a motivator in them to improve. However, in other cases, it caused students to get discouraged.

In Robert Littlefield's survey, college coaches commented on the commitment area that motivation of students was ranked first with not enough support from other faculty and administrators as second. Other areas were budget, too little credit, limited repeatability, rivalry with other campus activities, and too much work.⁴

Demands on their time and motivation were the two most serious factors concerning our students.

Lastly, the area of logistical problems caused many headaches. Making the necessary arrangements for each trip was time consuming. Reservations for

³Littlefield, Robert. "The Forensic Participation Course: What is it Really For?" paper presented at the Speech Communication Association (Chicago, IL: Nov. 1-4, 1985), p. 5.

⁴Ibid., p. 7.

transportation and motels, following the college procedure for absences from class, filing the necessary forms for authorization for a trip, arguing with the athletic coaches over the use of a van, having to arrive back at a precise time in order that another group could use the van for a trip -- all put this coach under stress and pressure.

Maintaining the financial records entailed red tape. The state policy for reimbursement was quite specific, and, often in certain situations, money had to be pulled out of the pockets of the students and coaches. On several occasions, the coach was not reimbursed for items spent on a forensic trip.

In order to establish credibility for the team, academic credit was given to participants. The record-keeping from practice time to competition became a problem. Establishing evaluative criteria for performance was time consuming. It had to be altered and changed several times during the semester with more realistic expectations being set for students.

A four-part evaluation system designed by Carolyn Keefe at Rhode Island University was tried. Her grading system had six important components: making it an integral part of the speech curriculum, informing the learner about the criteria on which the grade would be based, evaluating the intellectual and social development, getting feedback, and using an organized method of record keeping.⁵ I tried to implement this plan, but failed. My team was not experienced enough to handle this type of evaluation.

Robert Littlefield stated that if a participation course was going to be called a class and award students academic credit, then coaches had an obligation to follow certain guidelines. The participation course should have objectives, use a syllabus, provide for preparation and practice sessions, encourage tournament competition,

⁵Keefe, Carolyn. "A System for Evaluating Tournament Competition for Academic Credit," paper presented at the Eastern Communication Association (Providence, RI: May 2-5, 1988), pp. 3-6.

and have an appropriate format for evaluating a student's performance.⁶ My syllabus was inadequate and unworkable.

The students in this program suffered from the logistical problems. Perhaps my expectations were not stated well; my evaluation system was overwhelming; my scheduling was tight due to my inexperience. The mistakes in this area were my fault.

But in spite of the faculty/coach problems, the student problems, and the logistical problems, we all survived. With a summer vacation to allow energies to be rekindled and time to reflect on how to run a smoother program, perhaps by Fall our forensic team will be on its way to becoming an integral part of Longwood College.

In the conclusion of her paper, Grace Walsh offered several warnings against current forensic practices that can damage a solid program.

1. Coach "burnout." Many professors are leaving the activity because the demands are not conducive to normal living. Tournaments beginning on Friday and running through Sunday make arriving home in the early morning on Monday a harrowing experience. One coach commented that, when his little son started to cry when what he thought was a stranger was really his father at the breakfast table, the father decided to get a full-time teaching appointment. Family friction often results from excessive absenteeism of a spouse. Is it any wonder that coaching today does not seem to be as attractive as it used to be?⁷

In further support of this issue, Thomas Meulemans stated that after some years of coaching, our bodies and minds say "enough."

⁶Littlefield, pp. 7-8.

⁷Walsh, p. 47.

Forensic coaches who teach need superhuman powers to continue as both for long. We may still wreck our physical, intellectual and spiritual health along the way. And we find it next to impossible to find the additional time and energy we need to master the research, study and retooling which other educators take for granted.⁸ As a fifty-five year old coach, I found myself exhausted on Mondays after a weekend tournament. When the demand occurred for two or three weekends a month, I had a difficult time coping. With the complete responsibility for driving, chaperoning and judging on my shoulders, I was not able to relax and enjoy the learning experience. Perhaps coaches should be young, unmarried and adjunct faculty with superhuman capabilities.

2. The atmosphere of camaraderie was fast disappearing. Instead of relaxed enjoyment, and even a game of bridge now and then among coaches who were friends, the coach's time is spent trying to brief their team on how to beat the next day's "squirrel case" or a bigger problem yet – what names of judges should be scratched from the "approved" list tomorrow.⁹

If a concerted effort could be made by established teams to welcome new schools into the competitive arena, this sense of acceptance would establish a better relationship. Several times my team felt like the "new kids on the block" or the "outsiders."

When we attended the national competition at the University of Alabama, one of the highlights was the friendly atmosphere that

⁸Meulemans, pp. 3-4.

⁹Walsh, p. 47.

existed among schools. The seating at the banquet according to district encouraged talk and socialization. When rival competitors from our district made the cut, a great deal of enthusiasm was generated by their peers. Cheering for these students, attending their elimination rounds, and seeing them gain national recognition was a bonding experience.

With the 1990-91 school session beginning in four days, several goals have been set concerning Longwood's forensic team.

1. Recruitment

In Kevin Twohy's paper, "Developing the Recruiting/Public Potential of the Forensic Program," he summarized several elements that would enhance a forensic program. First, a pamphlet should be designed; second, college students should be judging at high school tournaments; third, newspaper coverage of forensic events; fourth, a two-week workshop in the summer; and fifth, publication of student's success should appear in the home-town newspaper.¹⁰

During this summer we have worked on and achieved each of the above elements. Several of the items were already being done by our college, but we had not seized the opportunity to use them as recruitment ventures.

2. Regularly scheduled group practices.

Since the time for individualized practice is so limited, we will utilize group efforts with experienced competitors working with newcomers. Peer coaching has been a valuable learning experience, according to Carolyn Keefe's research.¹¹ In addition, bonding between team members will occur.

¹⁰Twohy, Kevin. "Developing the Recruiting/Public Relations Potential of the Forensic Program," paper presented at the Speech Communication Association (New Orleans, LA: Nov. 3-6, 1988), pp. 5-6.

3. Smaller number of students on the team.

We will institutionalize tryouts for the forensic team in the Fall. Since we were new in the business, we tried to work with any student who was interested. This diluted time and energy from those students who wanted to become more competitive. With the tryout system, we can become more selective.

4. Better use of financial resources.

With a state-wide budget cut felt on all college campuses, we must have a better handle on spending money. Pooling transportation expenses with other colleges, selecting tournaments that are closer to us geographically, using fewer competitors who must perform in more events will make our money work with better results.

It has indeed been a learning experience. Without the help of many of the experts in the field, such as you, our program would not have survived at all. We are indebted for your cooperation, your advice, your reassurance, and your sense of humor. Our only hope is that we can continue and become more competitive.

As a new coach, may I challenge the American Forensic Association, the National Forensic Association, and the National Developmental Conference on Individual Events to:

1. Provide training for new coaches. Universities and colleges with successful programs might offer summer workshops or weekend courses with concrete suggestions on coaching tactics.
2. Offer demonstration workshops for new teams. Successful forensic teams might come to the campus for a series of programs, showing the event, talking about preparation, and explaining the

¹¹Keefe, p. 5.

judging procedures. In the spring we hosted three students from Harvard University who spent two days on our campus. They demonstrated types of speeches for our communication classes, performed an oral interpretation program, and visited student organizations. Their presence on our campus was stimulating to our students. We are hopeful to continue this exchange with other colleges and universities in the future.

2. Focus on socializing among the schools. Making friendships, sharing the value of competition, and being friendly with competitors would enhance our association with one another. At tournaments and conferences, a real effort could be made to have some informal "get togethers" for coaches and students.

The questions that I asked this year were "Why should I be involved in this program? Why should I continue to support forensics? Why am I working so hard?"

Kent Colbert and Thompeon Biggers, in a chapter entitled "Why Should We Support Debate?" stated that the literature suggests that debate/forensics provides benefits in at least three areas. First, forensic competition improves the students' communication skills. Second, forensics provides a unique educational experience because of the way it promotes depth of study, complex analysis and focused critical thinking. Third, forensics offers excellent pre-professional preparation.¹²

President John F. Kennedy summed it up well when he said,

I think debating in high school and college is most valuable training, whether for politics, the law, business, or for service on community committees such as the PTA and League of Women Voters. . . . The

¹²Thomas, David and Jack Hart. *Advanced Debate* (Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Co., 1987), p. 2.

give and take of debating, the testing of ideas, is essential to democracy. I wish we had a good deal more debating in our institutions than we do now.¹³

Longwood College accepted the challenge to begin an intercollegiate forensic team. We have survived the first year; we have a starting point; we have focus; and we are on our way to becoming a seasoned competitor.

¹³*Ibid.*, p. 8.

What the Rules Mean: Using Defined Judging Guidelines to Augment Informal Training

J.G. Harrington
Dow, Lohnes & Albertson (Washington, D.C.)

INTRODUCTION

Informal training of judges is a fact of forensic life. Unlike intercollegiate sports, forensics depends on a pool of interested amateurs to help determine which contestants are the best. Even the professionals among us learn how to judge mostly from our own experiences. This informality has advantages and disadvantages, but there can be no question that it leads to varying judging standards, with almost no way to count on a particular standard being applied to a particular event.

I believe that, absent some unexpected change, our current system of informal training is likely to persist, largely because the characteristics of forensic competition are unlikely to encourage the creation or maintenance of more uniform standards or formal training. Once we recognize those characteristics, we can look to alternative solutions to the problems created by the lack of formal training.

This paper proposes one approach to those problems and suggests how it could improve judging, as well as giving coaches and competitors a useful tool for improving their presentations. What I propose is that tournament directors prepare simple, non-binding judging guidelines for each event at their tournaments. Judging guidelines could do more than give novice judges a set of standards to apply to each event; they could also provide a way for the forensic community to begin to agree, in a basic way, on what we expect from competitors. In light of the

generally *ad hoc* approach we now take to determine what is and isn't meritorious and praiseworthy, I believe this would be an important step in the right direction.

THE PROBLEM

The problems of informal judge training arise, at least in part, from two sources. The first source is the lack of formal, elaborated standards for each of the events. The second source is the inability of the forensic community to adopt uniform standards for who may judge these events. Taken together, these root causes create much of the relative chaos in individual events judging.

Event Standards

The lack of formal standards for each event is perhaps best exemplified by the rules of the events. For instance, the rules of all of the events at the AFA-NIET fit comfortably, albeit in small type, on a single page. This is typical. There are few, if any, tournaments that provide more than the minimum page description of the events they offer.¹ Rather than providing a paradigm or guidelines for the event, they provide only basic information. The judge is left to fill in the blanks.

For example, the AFA rules for Extemporaneous Speaking read as follows:

Contestants will be given three topics in the general area of current events, choose one, and have 30 minutes to prepare a speech that is the original work of the student. Maximum time limit for the speech is 7 minutes. Limited notes are permitted. Students will speak in listed order. Posting of the topics will be staggered.

Several elements of these rules are noteworthy. Most of the rules focus on the process of the event, not what is to be presented. Even those parts of the rules that tell the auditor what the speaker may do fail to explain the elements of a good

¹One notable exception to this rule is Seth Hawkins' Southern Connecticut tournament, which provides some elaboration. Ironically, his Great Eastern invitation offers some of the shortest event descriptions extant.

extemporaneous speech. Instead, the rules say the speech may be seven minutes long, that the speaker may use notes and that the speech must be the speaker's original work. These rules, which are typical for this event, don't even require the speaker to speak on the topic chosen.

The rules for Extemporaneous Speaking are perhaps the most glaring example of opaque rules, in part because process is so important to the event. Most other events have somewhat more illuminating rules. For instance, the AFA After Dinner Speaking rules require a speech "designed to exhibit sound speech composition, thematic coherence, direct communicative public speaking skills, and good taste." On the other hand, the AFA requires contestants in Poetry Interpretation, perhaps the most demanding of the interpretive events for judges and contestants alike, to present "[a] selection or selections of literary merit, which may be drawn from more than one source," adding only that plays are prohibited, manuscripts are required, and that the entire program, including the otherwise unmentioned introduction, may be up to ten minutes long. These are not useful guidelines.

Most experienced judges know that the rules do not provide useful guidelines, except in relatively rare cases of speeches or pieces in the wrong events or which run overtime. Experienced judges develop their own paradigms for the events they judge, and they use these paradigms to explain their judging decisions on comment sheets and elsewhere. A casual perusal of back editions of *Championship Debates and Speeches* yields many examples of judges, either implicitly or explicitly, explaining their judging paradigms.²

²For examples of this, see Craig Dudzick's critique of the winning Communication Analysis in *1986 Championship Debates and Speeches*, pp. 117-118; Pamela Stepp's critique of the NFA-winning Extemporaneous Speech in *1987 Championship Debates and Speeches*, p. 140; and Todd Lewis' critique of the AFA-winning Informative Speech in *1988 Championship Debates and Speeches*, p. 111. There are many more examples in these books.

Unfortunately, developing sound informal paradigms takes a long time. In the current scheme, there is little that can be done to speed the process. One reason that former competitors are often favored as judges is that they often have spent four or even eight years competing -- more than enough time to develop their own paradigms. Even when experienced competitors begin to judge, however, the best the forensic community can hope is that these new judges have developed paradigms for the events they judge.

Moreover, the paradigms adopted by judges vary widely. Returning to Extemporaneous Speaking, even within the rules judges set many different standards. There are judges who penalize students for using notes, and there are judges who penalize students for failing to use notes.³ There are judges who want a citation for every fact, and judges who merely want to know that the contestant consulted one or two general sources. Even these relatively minor variations make it difficult for competitors to assess their progress, or to be certain they are judged fairly.

While, as discussed below, some of the variations in how an event is judged arise from a lack of judge education, much of it also arises from a failure of the forensic community to articulate or elaborate basic standards for each event. The net results are inconsistent judging and an inability to explain, with certainty, exactly what we mean by Impromptu Speaking or Prose Interpretation. For that matter, what judging uniformity we have is hard won and made more precarious by the community's inability to create basic judging standards. This suggests some sort of new approach is necessary.

³Competitors who are aware of this standard occasionally "refer" to blank note cards when speaking in front of these judges.

Judge Standards

In the absence of defined standards for events, one possible ameliorative device would be standards for judges themselves. Other competitive activities, ranging from baseball to figure skating, have defined hierarchies of their arbiters, and specific requirements for judging different levels of competition. Unfortunately, forensics does not, and there does not appear to be any significant likelihood that any formal judge training will emerge in the near future.

At present, judges enter forensics in something of a state of nature. The overwhelming majority of new judges depend only on their pre-existing knowledge of forensics. In many cases, this knowledge is minimal. Even the expertise of experienced competitors is most often limited to the events in which they excelled.

At the same time, there are no programs in place to fill the knowledge vacuum. The best instructions many judges get are the injunctions on the top of comment sheets to make comments that justify their ranks. There are no formalized training seminars or programs, and no official or unofficial guides to judging from the national organizations.⁴

There is little likelihood that this situation will remedy itself, or that forensic organizations will take the steps necessary to create a highly-trained judging pool. It would be difficult to imagine even weekend-long judging seminars being put into place, let alone the more extensive training that would be necessary to teach a judge every event. More importantly, given the chronic shortage of judges, it is even more difficult to imagine that a requirement for meaningful formal judge training could be imposed on any tournament, even at the national level. At the local or regional level, training requirements would appear an impossible ideal.

⁴A few local tournaments provide basic judging information. However, this information is often limited to the basic mechanics of judging. The Green Sheet distributed by Seth Hawkins, actually a four-page compilation, is an example of such a guide.

Adoption of a formal training requirement also would be made more difficult by the existing variations in judging standards for individual events. There is little point to teaching a judge the mechanical aspects of judging without also teaching what is meant, for instance, by such phrases as "literary merit" or "communication event."

The result of this training vacuum can be seen at every speech tournament. Judges fall back on their own experiences and on the almost-always inadequate rules. In many or even most cases, this is enough to produce both a fair result in the round being judged and a meaningful, accurate critique for the student. At the same time, there are far too many times when the judge fails to produce either a fair result or a meaningful critique. These failures hurt the educational process and the students' confidence in the forensic community's ability to evaluate the quality of their performances accurately.

Thus, the lack of specific, substantive event descriptions and the inability of the forensic community to train its judges in any formal way are very real phenomena. These phenomena result not only in widely varying approaches to the events, but in very real frustration for competitors and coaches alike. Moreover, it is apparent that it is unlikely that the forensic community will be able to create or enforce any formalized training requirements for judges. For that reason, it seems that the best approach is to begin to define the requirements of each event more specifically. The remainder of this paper is devoted to a proposal to do just that.

THE EVENT GUIDELINE SHEET

The essential problem of defining what we mean by "Persuasive Speaking" or "Dual Interpretation of Drama" can be approached in many ways. Most judges learn by example: they watch performances and define what each event is by

seeing what they like and don't like. This definition by example may be visceral or intellectualized, but the process is much the same either way.

Alternatively, it is possible to learn through explanations. Many novice judges and competitors are given brief thumbnail sketches of events: "An Informative is a speech that tells you about something without attempting to persuade you to do something about it." Competitors often learn this way by reading judges' explanations of ranks.

As commonly practiced, these are both piecemeal methods of learning. A judge is unlikely to develop a paradigm for an event from watching a single round, even a national-level final. Even the most extensive explanation leaves out many important essentials, like the function of organization or the importance of source citation. There is rarely any sense of an integrated whole, of putting all the pieces together, in either of these approaches.

There is, however, an alternative that will allow a new judge or, for that matter, competitor, to understand the whole of an event. That alternative is a formal guideline to the event, or what will be referred to in this paper as an Event Guideline Sheet.

The purpose of an Event Guideline Sheet would be to provide a brief explanation of all of the important elements of a successful performance in a particular event. An Event Guideline Sheet would bring together on a single page the rules for the event, a precis of what the judge should expect and short explanations of the individual elements of an event. There would be no "national" standard for Event Guideline Sheets, though national tournaments might choose to prepare them. Rather, each tournament director would prepare them for any event offered at his or her tournament. An example of an Event Guideline Sheet for Extemporaneous Speaking is attached to this paper.

Event Guideline Sheets would be available for judges to use at a tournament. The tournament director could make a point of giving the sheets to new judges and could make the sheets available to any interested judge or competitor. While ambitious tournament directors might include them in their tournament invitations, the intent of the Event Guideline Sheet is not to replace the rules but to supplement them.⁵

Adoption of Event Guideline Sheets would be likely to have several beneficial effects. At a minimum, they would provide novice judges with basic guidelines for the events they judge early in their careers. Event Guideline Sheets also could be important coaching tools for beginning competitors.⁶ While the level of detail on an Event Guideline Sheet would not approach the subtleties that often separate the very best competitors, it would certainly provide a good base on which to build judging and competitive expertise.

Event Guideline Sheets also would help to foster more uniform approaches to the various events. While a certain amount of variation and experimentation is certainly a good thing, widely varying regional standards serve only to frustrate contestants and coaches. Writing down explanations of the standards for individual events will also force those involved in the "codification" process to understand the reasons for those standards, which can only increase the sophistication of the

⁵It would be particularly useful to include Event Guideline Sheets in invitations to tournaments with unusual events. The 1990 edition of *Intercollegiate Speech Tournament Results* (ISTR) indicates that there were 34 events offered at five or fewer tournaments in 1989-90. 1990 ISTR at 25. Event Guideline Sheets might have increased entries in these unusual events, and certainly would have improved the likelihood that the performances in these events would meet the tournament organizers' expectations.

⁶ In fact, Event Guideline Sheets could, in many cases, be adapted from materials that coaches already have prepared to explain events to novices.

forensic community's approaches to performance, coaching and judging. At the same time, the voluntary nature of the guidelines will permit both innovation and a certain level of idiosyncrasy.

There are certain dangers in the widespread adoption of Event Guideline Sheets. The most important of these is that, if improperly designed, Event Guideline Sheets could become overly technical and, consequently, as useless to beginners as the current rules. Forensics constantly runs the risk of creating standards divorced from the real world, and Event Guideline Sheets could reinforce that tendency. However, a focus on the purpose of Event Guideline Sheets -- educating those who are not already trained to evaluate performances effectively -- would likely prevent this from happening.

CONCLUSION

This paper has outlined some of the implications of the current system of informal judge training, notably a wide variation in judging criteria. It also has explored elements of the causes of this variation, focusing on how the current rules force judges to develop event paradigms and the current and future inability of the forensic community to provide formal training. Because it is unlikely that formal judge training will be widespread in the foreseeable future, this paper proposes adoption, by individual tournament directors, of Event Guideline Sheets detailing the basic criteria for each event. Using Event Guideline Sheets has many potential benefits for judges, competitors and coaches, and the risks of using them are small. For these reasons, it seems likely that the adoption of Event Guidelines Sheets would benefit the forensic community and help to ameliorate some of the problems caused by the current regime of informal judge training.

Event Guideline Sheet Extemporaneous Speaking

Event Rules

Contestants will be given three topics in the general area of current events, choose one, and have 30 minutes to prepare a speech that is the original work of the student. Maximum time limit for the speech is 7 minutes. Limited notes are permitted. Students will speak in the listed order. Posting of the topics will be staggered.

What the Event Requires

In this event, contestants are expected to prepare a speech on a current events topic in a half hour. The topic will usually, but not always, be in the form of a question that the speech answers. The information in the speech should be documented from reliable sources. The speech may be up to seven minutes long. Contestants may use notes, but they are not required to do so. Because the contestants have only seven minutes to speak, they must be given time signals so they know how much of their time they have used.

What to Look For

1. *Attention Step:* The speech should begin in a way that catches your attention. Anecdotes, metaphors and descriptions of the importance of the subject are among the ways to do this.
2. *Introduction:* The speaker should connect the attention step to the topic in some way. The introduction may blend with the attention step.
3. *The Topic:* The speaker should tell you the topic, word for word. This is important because the topic is the driving force behind the rest of the speech.
4. *Thesis:* The speaker should tell you the central theme of the speech. Usually this will be his or her response to the topic. The thesis statement may also include reasons for that response.
5. *Preview:* A brief outline of what will be said during the body of the speech. This may be part of the thesis statement.
6. *Analysis:* The speaker should justify the conclusions reached in the thesis statement. This may be done by citing facts, by analogy or by any reasonable method of proof.
7. *Evidence:* The speech should include sufficient facts to back up the analysis. The speaker should tell you the sources of those facts, including dates and publications. The quality of the sources is also important. For instance, the *New York Times* is a better source than the *National Enquirer*.
8. *Delivery:* A clear and pleasant tone of voice is a plus. You should also look for good diction, good grammar and intelligent word choice.
9. *Topic Choice:* The speakers each choose one topic from among three. All other things being equal, a speaker who chooses a more difficult or unusual topic should be proportionately rewarded.

Helping the Inexperienced Director

Alice J. Jaswal, Ph.D.
Nebraska Wesleyan University

The formation of a new Individual Events program is an event welcomed by the forensics community for both philosophical and pragmatic reasons. Philosophically, there is a sense of reaffirmation of the worth of current I.E. programs and a sense of satisfaction that other students will have the opportunity to experience the benefits we believe such programs offer. From a pragmatic point of view, new programs in our geographical area can mean larger numbers of entries -- which may translate into more "legs" for those of us whose students need them. Also, perhaps at some later date, the new program may host a tournament -- which might help our travel schedules.

Ideally, this new program would come into existence with the total support of the administration of the college or university and a recognition for the need for munificent funding and for faculty with experience and training necessary to develop and run a quality I.E. program. Unfortunately, my experience with new or "revitalized" programs in my area of the country over the last twenty some years has led me to believe that this is not always the case. Sometimes, when urged by students who have had positive I.E. experiences in high school, or perhaps by alums who testify to the importance of a now-discontinued I.E. program, administrators may decide that they will give an I.E. program a try. However, they may feel unwilling or unable to commit much in terms of money and unwilling to hire an additional faculty member to be responsible for the program. Consequently, the person who teaches speech, or perhaps the person who teaches oral interp, or

perhaps the person who directs the plays is drafted -- or "made an offer s/he can't refuse."

Some people may argue that, unless the institution can provide adequate funding and experienced staffing, there should be no program. I imagine we all know of at least one prospective program which never really got off the ground because the "director" did not know what needed to be done and was unwilling to dedicate the tremendous amount of time and energy needed to learn about I.E. and then to run the program. However, I would also imagine that most of us can think of at least one or two programs in our area which started under less than auspicious circumstances and have managed to do reasonably well in terms of student involvement and success.

The programs I am aware of that fit into this latter category have been fortunate in having directors who, though their previous knowledge and experience in the wonderful world of forensics may have been extremely limited or even nonexistent, were willing to go far beyond "the call of duty" to learn about it. I believe those of us with established programs have an obligation to do whatever we can to help these fledgling directors. In point of fact, I would be willing to bet that most of us already do. What I would like to do in this presentation is to encourage thought/discussion about the sorts of things we need to do on an individual basis, and then raise the issue of what, if anything, the national organizations concerned with I.E. might do to help.

This paper is not a research project or an experimental study. It is based on my own experiences, on discussions with I.E. directors who felt they lacked adequate training, and on discussions with "seasoned" directors who have aided new directors and new programs.

The novice directors with whom I visited were unanimous in their choice of the most important thing they felt they needed, and that was an experienced

director who would be willing to serve as a mentor. Although there are probably several definitions of this term, in this context it seems to mean a person who will be available and willing to answer any and all questions relating to getting the I.E. program started, running it, publicizing it and anything else. Regardless of what the novice director has been able to read about I.E., there are always going to be some things which are confusing and need to be explained -- and sometimes explained and explained again. Perhaps equally as important in the long run is to make sure the new coaches have the opportunity to meet other coaches in the area and are made to feel welcome. One would expect that any new coach would be welcomed, but the novice coach is particularly in need of an encouraging reception. Hopefully, state organizations would make a special effort to integrate the new person into their planning meetings and to try to explain things which might be unique to the state or to the area.

Some of us teach courses on how to direct the high school forensics program. Often, we have handouts on coaching strategies for different events and lists of potential interp selections and speech topics. Obviously, not everything suitable for high school will be suitable on the college level, but at least there would be some concrete specifics to work from.

The new director should try to take a graduate or even an undergraduate course in directing the forensics program if at all possible. If it is not feasible, then s/he might consider attending a high school institute in the area. This would provide an opportunity to observe how coaches work with students and would also provide an opportunity to meet high school students who might be "recruitable" at a later date.

The rookie director may face a formidable task in trying to get students involved if the program is new or has been comatose for some time. The people I have visited with claimed they were most successful when they recruited out of

their own classes. People who do well on the first speech in the basic speech course may be bribed or blackmailed into polishing that speech and trying it at a tournament. Aspiring actors/actresses who audition for a play may be intrigued with the possibility of doing dramatic interpretation or a dramatic duo. Other teachers can be helpful in locating prospects. Some colleges have detailed activity information on incoming freshmen which might provide a list of names of people to contact about the program and what it has to offer. College newspapers are often looking for items relating to campus activities and frequently will provide a news story about the new program in an early issue. Many of us use an "interest night" to attract new participants and some suggestions as to what has worked well for us might provide the new person with ideas they can adopt or modify.

Very early on, the new director needs to learn what tournaments are available so that a tentative schedule may be developed. Some potential participants are very interested in knowing where the team will be going -- especially if they like to travel and a couple of tournaments are offered in interesting places. The AFA schedule is not likely to be available to anyone except current coaches -- so we need to be certain we share this with the new person. Often, we can also provide guidance in terms of the relative difficulty of the tournaments and perhaps advise which tournaments should be top priority ones if, as is often the case, funding is limited and only a few tournaments will be possible the first year.

General advice relating to money matters may be helpful. Things we take for granted like entry fees, judging ratio and judging fees, car/van rentals and meal allowances sometimes need explanation. The different national tournaments and their qualification procedures should be discussed at the beginning of the forensics season. Some administrations place a great deal of importance on national tournament participation, regardless of the qualification procedures.

The beginning director may wish to concentrate on only a few events. Those of us who are "experienced" need to make sure the rules for the different events are fully understood. Video tapes might be suggested. We might offer some of our more successful competitors as "demonstrators" and encourage them to share their experiences/perceptions of their events. Not only would this be helpful for those involved in the new program, it is also a positive experience for our students. We might invite the new director to observe some practice sessions as we work with our beginning students.

New coaches and competitors may benefit from attending an early tournament as observers. Those of us who have been at this activity forever tend to forget how confusing a tournament can be (although having novice participants who "didn't know they had to do more than one round" does serve to remind us now and then.) The use of codes, double and triple entries, tournament courtesies and conventions are easier to explain when they have been observed – although I must confess, it will "make sense" only when they have actually gone through it. First-time observers may need to be cautioned not to become discouraged; some of the people they will be watching have been involved in the event for several years.

The new person may need help filling out the tournament entry form and should be warned to check the rules for each tournament carefully as there are some tournament directors who decide to be creative and choose not to follow AFA rules. Deadlines need to be pointed out and problems caused by late drops explained. Some of the coaches I have talked with recalled not being prepared for the keen competitive atmosphere they encountered.

Many of us have a list of "do's and don'ts" for our competitors which a rookie coach might find helpful as a basis for preparing the novice competitor. It may be helpful to encourage the coach to think through what sort of expectations are realistic for the first tournament and how these expectations might be

communicated to the students. Perhaps a warning is in order about the potential for unusual ballots and inattentive judges. One beginning coach wished that he has been advised not to hand out ballots until the team was in the van so that the reaction to the ballots would have been limited to his own school.

Hopefully, after the first tournament, things will be much clearer for both coach and contestants. Sharing experiences and feelings about it and setting goals for the next tournament serve as an important "bonding exercise" for many squads - "older" as well as "beginning."

Remind the director to try to get as much publicity for the team's activity as possible. Sometimes a story about the number of students from the school who participated is about all you will want to include. Obviously, when a student does break to finals or wins a trophy, a longer story would be warranted. A story in the alumni news is also a good idea.

The success of some programs is measured by their administrations according to the numbers of students involved in the programs. If this is the case, the director will need to plan accordingly. In the beginning, a program may have rather low standards for participation in national tournaments. As more students become involved, expectations may be raised. I think it is important that those of us who have been involved for some time share our struggle with how to deal with hard-working students who may never be very successful in terms of winning, but who may be gaining valuable confidence and training when it comes to national tournament participation.

For those new programs with limited budgets, we may be able to provide some help. Those of us who run tournaments can give these programs a break on fees. Those of us with teams too large for cars, but not large enough to fill up the van, can provide transportation for a couple of students. In some cases -- such as

for a national tournament -- we may be able to accommodate one or two students with our own.

Although I believe the help given to "new" people by "seasoned" people is critical, I wonder if there should not be more of an effort made by national organizations to make life a little easier for the novice coach. Apparently, there is a packet designed for the beginning director/program put out by AFA, but its existence is not well publicized and there are difficulties in terms of keeping it updated. Hopefully, these difficulties can be solved and a way found to get the packet to the people who desperately need it. Certainly those of us who believe in the value of I.E. programs need to do whatever we can to help those inexperienced directors who are willing to try to provide I.E. opportunities to students who would otherwise not have them.

What I Think You Should Do Is . . .

Joel L. Hefling
South Dakota State University

Many of us who have been coaching for more than a few years have undoubtedly felt the effects of a lack of formal training for both coaches and judges. In fact, many of us have probably commented about that situation as we bemoan the poor choices of material that we hear from others' students, or try to explain why a judge has written particular kinds of comments on a ballot. At the same time that we decry the sad state of affairs with those new coaches and judges, we overlook the fact that we may have come through the same kind of process. It is easy for us to point accusing fingers at coaches and judges who are recent participants in forensic activities and assert that they have not been well trained, that they are not properly prepared for what they are doing. There may be an assumption that new coaches and judges are the ones who lack formal training. That assumption may not be accurate.

Apparently, the old adage is true: we learn by doing. Those of us who are fondly regarded as the "old buffaloes" among coaches may feel that we are the exception. If we can remember back as far as the days when we were receiving our coaching training, we may be able to recall that our training may have been relatively informal. There probably are not very many who were fortunate enough to have a teacher or mentor who took us by the hand and led us down the path to wisdom and understanding. Whatever amounts of wisdom and understanding are occasionally apparent may be the result of experience, observation, drawing

conclusions, and putting together a lot of related educational experiences. New coaches and judges may be faced with the same kind of situation.

If we conclude that veteran coaches and judges have had little or no formal training, and novice coaches and judges have had little or no formal training, then a number of implications begin to develop. For the sake of clarity, and to follow forensic conventions, let us examine several of those implications, first from the perspective of coaches, then from the perspective of judges, and finally from the perspective of the students. Then we may be able to draw some final conclusions for the forensic community as a whole.

Implication #1

There are no coaches or judges out there who have benefitted from formal training. At this point, it should become apparent that no definitions have been presented for either "formal" or "informal" training. Most of us have a pretty clear idea of what those words mean to us. If there are no coaches or judges who have had formal training, then we are all operating under the influence of informal training. So far, the reasoning process here is pretty basic. But if we are all operating under the influence of informal training, where did all the rules come from? Where did we find the authority figure to give credence to the need for standardized rules and to determine the content of those rules? It's not necessary to isolate a particular individual, but it may be helpful to remember that all of us have basically the same level of formal training. Individual experience may be helpful in giving us some guidance and direction, but anyone's experience can be just as helpful as anyone else's.

Implication #2

Novice coaches can provide some stimulating educational challenges for veteran coaches. If experience becomes a substitute for formal training, then

veteran coaches have a wonderful opportunity to share their experiential knowledge and expertise with novice coaches. It may be helpful to remember that education is for everyone, not necessarily just the students. Helping novice coaches to develop some effective techniques can be a rewarding experience for veteran coaches who may be needing a little intellectual challenge and stimulation. Of course, an underlying implication here is that the veteran coaches will be willing to share their ideas with the novice coaches, if they are not too possessive of their knowledge.

Implication #3

"Untrained" coaches, who probably are novice coaches, will likely approach performances without preconceived ideas about what is "right" or "wrong." Without those preconceptions, students and audiences may be subjected to some refreshing approaches to the communication process and the performance situation. Of course, there will probably be some resistance to methods that do not clearly follow the norms established, but that does not mean that the methods are not effective or appropriate. Viewing performances that are not part of the established stereotypes may help to stimulate the thinking processes of coaches and students alike, and perhaps can lead them to acceptance of differing ideas and concepts or to reinforce and justify previously held ideas and concepts. Either scenario can be beneficial. Novice coaches may be able to present some challenges that will lead veteran coaches to reflect on their own methodology and their reliance on some of the basic tenets of communication. While oversight functions might be appropriate for governmental agencies, in the training of effective communicators it can be an unfortunate mistake. Novice coaches, while being apologetic for their lack of formal training, may inadvertently direct others to some important considerations of basic skills and concepts that can improve the quality of communication for everyone.

Implication #4

Judges who lack formal training can prove to be relatively uncontaminated. Many of us have commiserated about having "lay" judges, those who have little or no background in forensics. We report that they cause us problems because they don't follow normal procedures in evaluating student performances and their comments frequently need to be interpreted for the students. These judges may very likely approach performance situations without preconceived ideas and will respond to the performances they actually hear and see, not what they expect to hear and see. A perceived need to translate or justify these comments and reactions suggests that students may be unable to adapt to varying audiences and reactions. Coaches may then need to work on helping the students to develop greater adaptability during their rehearsal sessions.

Implication #5

Judges who are untrained sometimes really do respond negatively to student performances. Judges who are "trained," or at least have several years of experience, sometimes respond negatively to student performances. While students and coaches alike have to be prepared for those situations, judges may need some reminders that students are trying to learn to improve their communication skills. It is more beneficial to offer some positive responses and to be able to provide some positive suggestions for the students. Students may need to be prepared in advance for the concept that not everyone will respond positively to their performances. It isn't possible to please every member of every audience with every performance. But it will be possible to learn from all of those responses.

Implication #6

Judges who are untrained may be able to provide some new insights and perspectives on student performances. Unfortunately, in order for those

perspectives to be useful, the students and their coaches need to be receptive to new insights and perspectives. As we are all aware, new ideas don't always agree with previously held ones, and that usually means the new ones aren't good. If we are willing to listen, coaches and students alike can learn from those judges who are frequently excused from credibility because they aren't trained.

Implication #7

Veteran students may feel some frustration working with novice coaches.

Implication #8

Veteran students may feel some frustration being judged by untrained judges.

Veteran students may have to learn to accept these two circumstances. In other words, they may have to learn to "deal with it." If a novice coach is the only resource available to them, they have little recourse: they can adapt to the coach's ideas; they can try to work out a compromise; they can quit. With untrained judges, compromising may not be an option.

With the previously listed implications in mind, let us now look at some concluding implications -- the "bottom line." We'll go a little beyond the problem/solution process and try to discover some underlying implications for the forensic community.

Implication #9

Novice students are a rare and unpopular commodity. They're hard to find, and when they do show up, they are hard to work with because they don't understand our language, they demand a lot of time and energy, and they seek constant approval.

Implication #10

Veteran students are a treasured commodity because they're easier and more rewarding. They also make us look better.

Implication #11

There seems to be a lack of definition for "trained." There seems to be a desire for coaches to be trained to coach and for judges to be trained to judge. But there seems to be no consistent definition for what that means. Coaches probably should be trained to teach, to educate. Judges probably should be trained to teach, to educate. Then the challenge is figuring out how to accomplish that.

Implication #12

The forensic community must remain adaptable, flexible. It's not possible to rely solely on trained/veteran coaches. It's not wise to rely solely on trained/veteran judges. If we are training students to be effective communicators, they need to be trained to be adaptable.

Implication #13

Goals need to be re-established, or confirmed. If there are valid implications and a feeling of frustration or concern about the field of forensics, it may occur because of a lack of firm, clearly established goals for coaches, judges and students.

Implication #14

Coaches aren't educating students. Many coaches don't know how to educate students. Many coaches have no background (training) in education or education curriculum. In responding to the perceived demands of colleagues, students, administrators and ourselves, we tend to train competitors. Society and life can do that. We need to be training communicators. That is an educational process that

requires knowledge and understanding of basic principles of communication that may be lacking for many coaches.

Implication #15

There seems to be a need for coaches to be strong leaders and teachers. A colleague once indicated that a coach should be all things to all people. The catch is figuring out what that is. It is time consuming. It is mentally, physically and emotionally draining. It is stressful. It is rewarding.

Implication #16

Coaches need a break. Occasionally, a coach will take a rare "weekend off." That usually means either sending the students out with an "untrained" novice coach and worrying all the time they are gone, or it means keeping the students home and spending additional hours in rehearsal or at least feeling slightly guilty because the students (and coach) are missing a tournament somewhere. There is no "break" in that scenario. Coaches need a real break, with no pressures from the coaching and no sense of guilt. Perhaps a week or two would be appropriate. Perhaps a month would be good.

Implication #17

The forensic community is becoming a closed, self-centered society. While this may sound like a prediction, it may be a reasonable implication of some of the concerns that are implied in the notion of having untrained coaches and judges. If there are those individuals who really are untrained, that may simply cause the veterans a little uncertainty. Frequently, we tend to isolate those who are untrained and rely more heavily on those whom we can count on to follow the normal patterns of responses. This practice does not allow students opportunities

to experience new and different responses, and it does not allow veteran coaches to experience new ideas and have an opportunity to reinforce basic concepts.

Implication #18

In order to overcome what may be perceived as problems, the forensic community may need to establish a system of utilizing veteran coaches and judges to provide some training for novice coaches and judges. Care would need to be exercised in order to encourage the sharing of new ideas and responses, instead of perpetuating previously established norms. That brings us back to the educational process again.

These are not purported to be an inclusive series of implications. Hopefully, they will stimulate some thinking and discussion. If the bottom line of the forensic activity is to educate students and help them to become more effective communicators, then we must start by reinforcing our own educational goals and communication skills.

This paper will support the thesis that more training of forensics coaches and judges, whether formal or informal, needs to take place in order to address many of the concerns of the forensic community in regard to inequities in coach/judge expertise and to philosophical inequities in the criteria for events by which coaches and judges fulfill their supervisory and evaluatory responsibilities in helping students become more effective communicators.

Implications of the Informal Training of Coaches and Judges

Robert L. Davenport
University of Montevallo

Reflecting on the ten years this author has spent coaching and judging forensics in different capacities, the author soon realized that most of his knowledge and philosophy of coaching and judging has been achieved either through "trial and error" or through occasional "tips" along the way from colleagues. The author received very little instruction and training in developing coaching techniques and judging philosophies as a graduate student, even though he was coaching in an established forensics program.

Consequently, while preparing this paper, this writer pondered the idea that perhaps many of us who are now directors of forensic programs also had to learn these techniques the "hard way." That is not to say that there is no merit in prospective coaches learning many things through "first-hand" experience, etc. However, it occurs to this author, at least, that too much of the training many of us received was "informal," which, I believe, has created some of the same problems that we usually attribute to lay or hired judges at our tournaments. That perception leads this author, therefore, to delineate, in this paper, the thesis that

not only do forensic educators need to continue addressing the issue of hired judges and increasing their competency, but we also must consider the need to further educate our graduate assistant coaches and assistant directors of forensics in order to increase their competence as coaches/judges.

Most coaches, naturally, were forensics competitors and thus understood, for the most part, many of the events they began coaching. However, they probably also started coaching students in events in which they had never competed or for which they had little affinity. As a result, many of us had to "sink or swim" in learning the criteria for those events and then imparting that information to our students, while pretending to be competent enough to coach them in particular events. That same uncertainty, at least in this author's case, carried over into the judging of these events in competition.

While many of our students' complaints, whether justified or not, about judging have been directed toward hired judges, we as coaches should also be willing to admit possible cognitive and philosophical limitations in ourselves in regard to coaching/judging specific individual events. Some of you may remember the specific examples of judge arrogance and incompetence that were brought up at the NFA National Assembly meeting in April [1990] at Mankato State.

This concern, which supports the above-mentioned thesis of this paper and subsequent analysis, was also substantiated by Professor Norbert Mills, when he quoted Faules, Rieke and Rhodes from their book *Directing Forensic* (1976), who stated:

The validity of a judgment depends largely upon the ability of the judge to understand what is being judged. This means that the judge must have knowledge about the criteria that he/she uses to arrive at the decision.¹

¹Norbert H. Mills. "Judging Standards in Forensics: Toward a Uniform Code in the '80's." *National Forensic Journal*. (1) Spring 1983: 20.

David Dunlap reinforced that statement when he remarked at the Second National Conference on Forensics in 1984:

The greatest challenge facing individual events is not increasing the competence of its judges, but rather in increasing the competence of its critics.²

C.T. Hanson made an even stronger statement:

Perhaps more than any other criticism, the forensic community is especially vulnerable on the issue of judge competency. Quality has been sacrificed on numerous occasions in tournaments to accommodate a large quantity of events Creating a condition of competency in a critic necessitates as much, if not more, educational training than does creating a condition of competency in forensic competitor.³

Kathryn Elton (1989) wrote a thought-provoking article concerning the forensics program at the University of Minnesota, which is operated entirely by graduate students, and concerning the fact that, as she says, "The University of Minnesota is one of the many programs that offer absolutely no training on any aspect of forensics."⁴ She stated further that "it is more often than not a learn-by-doing, hands-on experience."⁵

With the added awareness of forensics researchers toward the continuing concerns about fairness in tournament judging and in bridging the gap in disparity between judges' decisions (ranks and ratings) in tournament competition, aided especially by the editorial staff of the *National Forensic Journal*,⁶ it is now time for

the forensic community to consider the concept of further educating its coaches/judges by developing ways in which we can give more formal as well as informal training to graduate assistants, assistant directors of forensics, faculty helpers, and lay (hired) judges. With that challenge in mind, the rest of this paper will seek to explore possible ways to accomplish this goal.

In partial response to Norbert Mills' call for a uniform code of judging standards and criteria for each event,⁷ the scholars who studied judging issues at the Second National Conference on Forensics in 1984 stated, as part of their recommendations under Resolutions 46 and 48, that tournament directors especially should make available to all critic/judges all of the information they will need concerning the events they will judge, through the use of seminars/workshops, lists of criteria for each event, etc.⁸ Since then, David Ross⁹ and Kevin Dean¹⁰ have extolled the virtues and numerous advantages that can be gained from conducting judging workshops before and/or during a tournament. Ross, in particular, cites at least three meaningful advantages to a judging seminar:¹¹

1. It ensures valuable critiques for students by identifying possible criteria upon which to base a decision.
2. A judging seminar can maximize fairness in competition.
3. It is an opportunity to arrive at standardized rules for events.

Calling for Clarification not Prescription." *Journal of the American Forensic Association*. 24 (4), Spring 1988: 251-257.

⁷Norbert H. Mills. *National Forensic Journal* 1(1), Spring 1983: 19-31.

⁸Murphy, p. 91.

⁹David Ross. "Improving Judging Skills through the Judge Workshop." *National Forensic Journal* 2(1), Spring 1984: 33-40.

¹⁰Dean, pp. 251-257.

¹¹Ross, pp. 37-38.

²John Murphy. "Order and Diversity: The Search for Judging Standards in Individual Events." In *American Forensics in Perspective*; papers from the Second National Conference on Forensics. Donn Parson, ed., 1984: 92.

³Murphy, p. 92 [emphasis mine].

⁴Kathryn Elton. "Second Among Equals: The Graduate Student Perspective." *National Forensic Journal*. 7 (1), Spring 1989: 56 (emphasis mine).

⁵Elton, p. 56.

⁶Norbert H. Mills. "Judging the After Dinner Speaking Competitor: Style and Content." *National Forensic Journal*. 2 (1), Spring 1984: 11-18; Edward J. Harris, Jr. "Rhetorical Criticism: Judges' Expectations and Contest Standards." *National Forensic Journal*. 5 (1), Spring 1987: 21-25; See also Kevin W. Dean. "Judge Training for Individual Events: Case Studies

Dean more specifically outlined the procedures and advantages gained from day-of-the-tournament workshops, especially the one developed when he was at Ball State University.¹²

When the University of Montevallo forensics team reinstated an invitational tournament in February of this year (after an eight-year hiatus), this writer implemented a judging workshop which was held on two consecutive weeks before the tournament. Several faculty members who had agreed to judge in the tournament attended the workshop, which consisted of an explanation of each event offered, instruction on how to fill out a ballot and summary sheet, explanations as to judge etiquette, and then actual judging of live student performances. The faculty members who attended were very appreciative of the effort we made to educate them to the nuances of forensics competition and judging in particular.

In preparation for this paper, this researcher sent an open-ended questionnaire to those faculty members after the tournament, seeking to gain input and insight from them as to the strengths and weaknesses of the workshop. Here is a sampling of their responses:¹³

1. I learned how to judge the events. This was my first experience as a judge, and I found the discussion and the 'live' example very helpful. It gave me some idea what to expect and greatly reduced my anxiety about judging.
2. You can strengthen this workshop by passing out handouts which list criteria for each specific event.
3. Get more participants (more discussion = more learning) to attend. Maybe you can pay workshop attendees the equivalent of one round of judging as an incentive to attend.

¹²Dean, pp. 253-254.

¹³Responses to questionnaire sent to Montevallo faculty judges, July 9, 1990.

This author found the workshop to be extremely beneficial both to the faculty/judges and to the students who participated in the workshop by giving them "live" examples to critique.

Event though we did not conduct a workshop during the tournament, this writer finds Ross' and Dean's suggestions for workshops at that time full of possibilities, not only for the hired judges, but especially for the coaches in attendance at any tournament. Ross reported that, while his seminars received mixed reviews due to the timing of the workshops, he felt that the advantages outweighed any timing disadvantages because, in his words, "a seminar can be an effective vehicle for identifying and prioritizing judging criteria, as well as helping coaches to be better critics by seeking the counsel of those most qualified in specific events."¹⁴

This author would also like to advocate that tournament directors consider the possibility of post-tournament judging workshops, not necessarily for coaches from different schools because of travel constraints, but particularly for the hired judges. This workshop, perhaps held a week or so after the tournament, would allow these judges to express their feelings about the judging experience overall and then give them a chance to assess their individual strengths/weaknesses in critiquing student performances and present suggestions as to how the workshops could be improved in the future. If we are to improve judge competency, as mentioned earlier, then this writer strongly feels that we need to provide guidance to those judges before, during and after a tournament. We read much in educational literature about the need to assess what we do in the classroom and professionally; that need is no less significant and important in dealing with the concerns we face in supervising and judging students in forensic activity. If we are

¹⁴Ross, p. 40.

willing to make the effort to continually assess ourselves, then it seems to be logical to assert the claim that we will also need to answer many of the concerns we have concerning judge agreement in ranking and rating student competitors, fairness in judging, becoming more competent coaches, judge indiscretions (in terms of unnecessary, disparaging comments on critique sheets), etc. Students will always complain about judges, but we can educate coaches/judges to the extent that they can cease to be, in Kevin Dean's words, "the scapegoat of poor tournament performance."¹⁵

The author would also like to advocate the following:

1. The forensic community should continue to consider and follow the guidelines set forth by Resolution 48, passed at the Second National Conference on Forensics.
2. Directors of forensics should meet with their assistants regularly to discuss coaching and judging philosophies and to ensure that their assistants are competent articulators of the rules and criteria for each event as they coach the students in their program.
3. Tournament directors should consider the benefits to be gained from conducting pre-tournament, day-of-the-tournament, and/or post-tournament workshops.
4. At universities where classes in Directing Forensics are offered, students should receive equal instruction in coaching/judging individual events as they often receive in coaching/judging debate.

IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

There is much to be gained from an honest appraisal of this subject and of our methods of coaching and judging forensics competitors fairly and competently. This report has merely raised some questions and posed some challenges along with a few suggestions pertaining to the informal training that most coaches and judges receive. Informal training is not altogether a negative concept, but this is one important aspect of the forensic activity that continues to necessitate reforms and

¹⁵Dean, p. 251.

further research. This author would personally like to see more articles written on coaching techniques, ways in which coaches can be trained (both philosophically as well as administratively), and further discussions as to the merits and successes of judging seminars. I commend the editorial staff of the *National Forensic Journal* for providing the opportunities and the space for forensics researchers to explore every aspect of individual events, just as debate has been perused from almost every angle since the early part of the century in many of our respected journals. Future coaches and judges, even though they need the academic freedom to develop themselves philosophically and otherwise, do not need to be left to "sink or swim" when it comes to learning how to effectively train students in the art of communicating in competition and in real life. As Kevin Dean ably remarked:

While we must guard against the proliferation of restrictive practices, such as the articulation of detailed and formulaic judging criteria that bind and stifle the creativity we wish to cultivate in our students, we must concurrently strive to protect the student from the innocent ignorance of the inexperienced judge. Just as we work to elevate our students from novice to varsity, we must strive to elevate the judges who serve at our tournaments from the type who write, 'Good job . . . tough round -- 8/70' to those who provide students with critical comments and insights which aid the student in further shaping the event.¹⁶

¹⁶Dean, p. 254.

Strategic Recruitment

Keith Denslow
University of Nebraska

Very few directors or coaches would deny that students are the most important part of a forensics program. Before quality forensics education can begin and before competitive success can appear, the students have to be recruited. Recruiting quality students is a major concern for both beginning and established programs.

It is surprising that one of the most challenging and most important duties of forensics directors has received so little attention. The area of recruitment and retention has not received enough attention in our scholarly forms. Dunham (1968) pointed out that there has been a great deal of attention devoted to the issue of star systems in team membership but does not discuss ways a program can gain student interest. Klopff & Lahman (1967) are a bit more elaborate and devote slightly over a page to the examination of methods for recruiting prospective students. Assuming that there is little more to say about the subject, other texts concerned with directing and administering forensics have similarly paid scant attention.

This paper suggests that the process of recruitment should be more closely examined. Examples of current methods of recruitment will be reviewed, a framework for a systematic recruitment campaign will be suggested, and practical techniques displayed.

Current methods of recruitment are familiar and easily described. The most typical method of recruitment is to ask for referrals. Coaches ask veteran team members if they know any students coming to the university who might be

interested in forensics. Likewise, a director asks other instructors to look for promising talent in oral performance classes. Invitations and announcements are sent out about the team's first meeting of the academic year. A squad may even set up a booth on Freshman Friday and introduce the activity along with a hundred other campus organizations. Occasionally, coaches have enough free time and energy to view or talk with talented prospects at high school tournaments. A smaller section of forensics participants are required to engage in the activity by degree or certification standards.

While these types of recruitment have been effective, under close examination they seem very random. Veterans would tend to suggest people they would like to have as team members and leave out equally talented people they dislike. Other instructors may refer their best students while overlooking someone who would benefit most from the educational opportunities of forensics. Squad meeting announcements, orientation mixers, and tournament recruitment are all methods which are broad in their scope and random in their selection.

The same methods could be faulted for appealing mainly to students predisposed to engaging in forensic activities. Veteran students will suggest people coming to the university from their high school team or people they remember competing against during tournaments. Posted or distributed invitations to squad meetings attract students with past experience or some knowledge of what forensics activities entail. Certainly, recruiting at high school tournaments draws on a pool of prospects which are already familiar with the activity.

An alternative of a systematic or strategic recruitment campaign would be more effective and would lead to greater understanding of the forensics community. A systematic campaign would allow a team to target promotions of forensics skills to different segments of the student body.

Fine (1987) states "the borrowing of marketing concepts by public and nonprofit institutions" can be extremely helpful to the organization (p. 71). The field of marketing management has devoted considerable attention to identifying "needs" and targeting promotions. McCarthy (1971) provides an outline from which a targeted recruiting campaign can be devised. A forensics coach should analyze: (1) potential recruits; (2) recruitment mixes; (3) the team's ability to provide for these recruitment mixes; and (4) team objectives.

Taking these steps in a recruitment campaign pushes a forensics coach to carefully consider the role of the team in the university setting and how best to educate and promote the benefits of involvement in the activity. Rather than a random effort which tends to reach students already with some interest in forensics, a targeted campaign helps develop strategies for the development of the team while exposing new groups to the skills and concepts of inter-collegiate speech and debate.

The concern of potential recruits has been given some consideration as part of program objectives. Rieke (1968) discusses the value of diversity in forensic education. Dunham states that "if a teacher is concerned with meeting needs of students, he should try to involve as many students in the program as possible" (p. 101). Still, the issue of who can benefit from the particular design and focus of the program should be included in the recruitment strategy.

Equally important is the concern of what mixture of students would facilitate the best forensic education and encourage the building of a pleasantly diverse learning atmosphere. If the team is considered a microcosm of the university, then the director should attempt to recruit a mixture which is representative of the student body. Efforts should be made to recruiting a cross-section of majors along with minority and physically disabled students.

Team resources such as coaching time, facilities, and budget may all affect the strategy to recruit the desired mixture of students. Larger numbers of students may stretch the resources a team has available, and concessions for the sake of recruiting mix may need to be made. For example, travel and care of physically challenged students may require special vehicle and hotel arrangements. Possible resource shortages should be anticipated and the recruitment strategy should include answers for such questions.

Finally, the team objectives must be included and expressed in the recruitment strategy. When recruiting prospects, it becomes imperative that the student learns what the team hopes to achieve. Clearly outlined estimates of the amounts of time and effort to reach different accomplishments should be available. The inclusion of the objectives in the strategy allows recruits to understand what becoming a "member of the team" means.

Within the framework of strategic recruitment, there are two main functions to the process: promotion about the benefits which accrue from participation in forensics activities to gain attention, and provide an opening for education about the opportunities available.

Target promotions gain the attention of specific segments of the potential recruits. One method which can be used is the testimonial method. Posters and flyers with testimonials by famous persons can be used to gain attention and entice prospects into learning more. Testimonials by Lee Iacocca such as "I was a member of the debate team" or "Not every manager has to be an orator or a writer. But more and more kids are coming out of school without the basic ability to express themselves clearly," could be used to attract the attention of business, accounting, and engineering students. Business, home economics and interior design major may be influenced by statements from Mary Kay Ash such as: "I became interested in the debating team and became a member and won some honors. I've never lost

my love for extemporaneous speaking." Pre-law, political science and minority students may gain an interest if it is pointed out that Barbara Jordan was a champion speaker in college. "I was the Tennessee State debating champion," proclaimed by Ted Turner, may kindle the interest of broadcasting or business majors. Other examples are easily available from sports, education and science.

Other promotional methods may include special lectures or publications about the benefits of communication and argumentative training. Each of these promotions must be directed to gain the attention of specific target groups of potential recruits. Rather than attempt to present the same benefits to everyone, strategic recruiting will focus the message for each audience.

The other step in the recruitment strategy is education about the opportunities available in forensics. A major portion of this effort should be directed at the advisors of majors, classes and campus organizations. It is still true that we hear academic colleagues exclaim: "Forensics . . . isn't that cutting up dead bodies?" A concerned effort must be established and maintained to help advisors understand both the activity and its benefits for students.

The strategy of education should also be targeted to the specific audience. Several recent studies from *Communication Education* provide support for the importance of communication education for anyone in the business world. Forensic education has been shown to be particularly helpful in the legal profession. Strategic recruiting will, in effect, show student and advisor what forensics is and why it is important.

Works Cited

- Ash, Mary Kay (1981). *Mary Kay*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Christson, Greg (1985). *Lead, Follow, or Get Out of the Way*. New York, NY: Bantam.
- Dunham, Robert E. (1968). "Administration of Forensic Programs," in *Directing Forensics: Debate and Contest Speaking*. Scranton, PA: International, pp. 95-120.
- Faules, Don F. & Richard D. Rieke (1968). *Directing Forensics: Debate and Contest Speaking*. Scranton, PA: International.
- Fine, Seymour H. "Social and Nonprofit Marketing: Some Trends and Issues," in *Advances in Nonprofit Marketing*. Greenwich, CT: J.A.I., pp. 71-98.
- Haskins, James (1977). *Barbara Jordan*. New York, NY: Dail.
- Iacocca, Lee (1984). *Iacocca: An Autobiography*. New York, NY: Bantam.
- Klopf, Donald W. & Carroll P. Lahman (1967). *Coaching and Directing Forensics*. Skokie, IL: National.
- McCarthy, Jerome (1971). *Basic Marketing*. Homewood, IL: Irwin.
- Rieke, Richard D. (1968). "A Philosophy of Forensics," in *Directing Forensics: Debate and Contest Speaking*. Scranton, PA: International, pp. 33-78.

When We Don't Know How to Get Where We're Going . . . Perhaps It's Time We Find a Map

Sharon Porter, Ph.D.
Northern Arizona University

Reviewing American Forensics in Perspective: Papers of Second National Conference on Forensics, Roger Aden notes

...discussion of already agreed upon general philosophies tend to obscure the need for treatment of smaller, more pressing issues....the feeling that forensics is in good shape philosophically dilutes the the obligation members of the community feel to address specific concerns that do receive illumination....the forensic community is so convinced of the value of forensics (as it should be) that it often neglects to examine seriously or, after examining to act upon the real (the philosophy in practice)....Perhaps one of the problems in the idealism/realism dichotomy is that forensic organizations are reluctant to legislate or encourage change.¹

Gerald M. Phillips indicates "...organization is the opposite of confusion ... An organization is, at its roots, a cooperative attempt to overcome confusion, chaos, anarchy and personal feelings of boredom, meaningless, and ineffectuality."² Jerry Anderson concludes "An organization is justified by its ability to provide for its constituency means of accomplishing goals which individuals cannot as effectively accomplish alone."³ The numerous forensic community organizations can be viewed on either the micro or macro levels. There are organizations on the high school,

¹ Roger Aden, "Review of American Forensics in Perspective: Papers of the Second National Conference on Forensics," *National Forensic Journal* (Fall 1987), 106-107.

²Gerald Phillips, *Communicating in Organizations* (NY: Macmillan, 1983), 16.

³Jerry Anderson, "Comment and Report from the President: New Circumstances Demand Renewed Commitments and New Responses," *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, IX (Fall 1972), 330.

community college and university levels. There are organizations that address specific areas of competition including policy debate, nonpolicy debate and individual events. There are honorary organizations. There are professional organizations and coordinating organizations. A hierarchy can be defined as "persons or things arranged in a graded series"⁴, "a position in a scale of rank, quality or order."⁵ Currently most of the forensic associations are autonomous organizations which do not exist in a hierarchical fashion. Nor is it the position of this paper that a hierarchy of these groups should be established.

This paper will outline four issues that are indicative of the concerns of the forensic community. The lack of focus and the nonexistence of a clear line of responsibility between the American Forensic Association, the Speech Communication Association-Forensic Division and the Council of Forensic Organizations serve as impediments in accomplishing these and other goals. Since the restructuring of the forensic organizations offer promise for correcting these difficulties, guidelines for the restructuring process will be advanced. Finally, a possible model will be advocated which could bring about a more effective administrative structure for collegiate forensics.

THE ISSUES

The 1984 National Developmental Conference on Forensics and the First National Individual Events Conference of 1988 itemized over fifty issues that mandated concern on the part of the forensic community. To gain an understanding of the problems the forensic community faces, an issue from four general areas into which these issues fall will be examined. The items that will be examined are the

⁴*The Merriam Webster Dictionary* (NY: Pocket Books, 1974), 334.

⁵*The Merriam Webster Dictionary*, 311.

schism between various factions of the forensic community, the necessity to enhance the image of the discipline, the importance of encouraging research and the coordination of forensic-sponsored Speech Communication Association convention programs.

Factions

Discussion of various factions in the forensic community focuses on two issues. The concern with the division between four year colleges, two year colleges and high schools was voiced as early as 1964 and was mentioned again in 1972, 1974 and 1976.⁶ In the fall of 1974 concern was expressed between programs oriented primarily toward debate and those that focused on individual events. W. Scott Nobles crystallized these issues and established them as a priority for AFA.

AFA must serve, and endeavor to unite, the entire forensic community.... The Association should be equally responsive to the needs of four year colleges, two year colleges, and secondary schools, to programs emphasizing debate and to those emphasizing individual speech contest competition; to larger national tournaments and to those more regionally oriented; to primarily competitive programs and to campus and/or community based audience programs. AFA should not only serve the interests and needs of varied forensic programs, it should also exert leadership in unifying the efforts of these sometimes divided elements of the forensic community.⁷

Although the division between debate and individual events is no longer at the forefront of concern, the collegiate forensic community is still struggling with the necessity of becoming more responsive to community college and high school colleagues. This item assumed priority again last year as the AFA faced a dramatic

⁶Robert Huber, "Reaching Maturity," *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, 1 (Jan. 1964), 27; Anderson, 329; W. Scott Nobles, "Report from the President: Continuing Challenges and Prospects for Progress," *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, XI (Fall 1974), 72; James F. Weaver, "Comments from the President: Quiet Times, Significant Goals and a Call for Involvement," *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, XIII (Fall 1976), 62.

⁷Nobles, 75.

decrease in membership when the Texas Forensic Association no longer required their high school coaches to maintain AFA membership.

Image

In 1974 Nobles also established a priority of enhancing the image of forensics.

Among the general public, within other academic departments, and frequently within our own academic departments, the educational value of forensic courses and programs are neither clearly understood or highly valued. By better definition of goals and values, by the assurance of high professional standards, by constant evaluation of our own programs, and by maintaining improved visibility through old and new public relations methods, we must enhance our professional and educational image.⁸

In 1976, James Weaver commented ". . . it is obvious that we have not yet begun to tap our potential in the area of public relations."⁹ The argument that the forensic community should enhance external public relations normally centers on increasing involvement in televised political debates.¹⁰ While some progress has been made with consultants providing advice in state and national political races, much more work could be done in this area. In fact the argument might be advanced that we have actually lost ground. While the film *Listen to Me* achieved some visibility, the Championship Debates series broadcast by The National Broadcasting Company in 1962 was viewed by an estimated audience of five million. ". . . the first intercollegiate-debate program to be televised nationally . . . the program consisted of a sixteen-week series of debates featuring outstanding college teams in tournament competition The income from this source gave AFA the financial stability to undertake a printed journal."¹¹

⁸Nobles, 75.

⁹Weaver, 63.

¹⁰Huber, "Reaching Maturity," 26.

¹¹Gifford Blyton, "The American Forensic Association: A History," *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, VII (Winter 1970), 15.

Current trends within the academic community provide reasons to be less than optimistic about progress with that public. The rank of forensic positions as well as the current pay scales indicate that the Director of Forensic position on many campuses is viewed as an entry level position. In some regions of the country there is a trend to make the Director of Forensic position a staff rather than a faculty position. This change of status is indicative of a predisposition on the part of the university community to view forensics as an extra-curricular activity rather than a viable scholarly area of study. Finally, the difficulty that many forensic directors have securing tenure is problematic. Thus, although forensic personnel know the advantages of the activity, effectiveness in articulating these values is questionable.

Research

References to the necessity of encouraging scholarly research in forensics move from a general statement of concern in 1972 to much more specific discussion of the issue in later years. In 1972 Jerry Anderson wrote "Thus improved communication, extensive consultation, and continued collection and dissemination of research results on the value of forensics are needed correctives."¹² The 1974 National Developmental Conference on Forensics recommended "A formal recognition of the obligation of forensic educators to contribute to scholarship, whether through public or other methods."¹³ Responding to the charge of the National Developmental Conference on Forensics the AFA established the goal in 1976 to "...broaden the emphasis of AFA from a solely competitive orientation to encompass research and theoretical exploration through increased utilization of the Research Committee."¹⁴

¹²Anderson, 330.

¹³ Nobles, 74.

¹⁴Weaver, 64.

Although research has been a priority of the forensic community for almost two decades, journal editors can attest that often submitted articles are insufficient in number and /or quality to fill the pages of our current journals. Additionally, attempts to provide incentives in the form of grants to encourage research have met with limited success.

Programming

Coordination of forensic programs at the SCA Convention continues to be a problem. The minutes of the 24th Annual American Forensic Association in 1972 reflect that "The Vice-President discussed the problem of coordination between the Vice-Chairman of the Forensic Division and the AFA Vice-President in convention programming."¹⁵ The November 8, 1973 Minutes of the Speech Communication Association Division of Forensics "Approved continued cooperation between program planners of AFA and the Forensic Division of SCA."¹⁶ Today the difficulty is magnified. Instead of two organizations sponsoring forensic programs, there are now five. Two years ago the failure to adequately coordinate programs resulted in one participant presenting the same paper on three different panels, sponsored by three different organizations. While last year attempts to cross-check programs eliminated this difficulty, the suggestion that the chair or vice-chair of the Speech Communication Association Forensic Division coordinate all forensic programs met with resistance because of the work involved. This complaint did not stem, however, from the person who would have had to assume these responsibilities.

Mark Knapp isolated still another difficulty regarding forensic sponsored programs.

¹⁵"Minutes of the 24th Annual American Forensic Association Meeting, Dec. 1972," *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, IX (Winter 1973) 383.

¹⁶"Minutes of the Speech Communication Association, Division of Forensics, Nov. 8, 1973," *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, X (Spring 1974), 261.

But there is another issue which also comes up during discussions among past SCA presidents who have done SCA programs and worked with the various forensic organizations. I don't pretend to speak for them nor to state the issue as they would but it goes something like this: We (SCA) have continued to bring into the association a number of forensic organizations, but No? have not done anything to centralize the programming efforts so we have now reached a point where, with each organization/group having their own set of programs, the total number of programs sponsored by and representing forensics seems disproportionate to the role of forensics in SCA or in the field in general.¹⁷

The problem is not simply that the number of programs is disproportionate. A perusal of last years programs illustrates that sponsors offer programs across the spectrum of forensic activities blurring the distinction between the organizations. Although the programs sponsored by the National Forensic Association and the Cross Examination Debate Association reflected the mission and scope of those groups, programs sponsored by Pi Kappa Delta, Forensic Division and the American Forensic Association reflected the broad based scope of these groups and covered a wide range of topics of both a competitive and noncompetitive nature.

These four issues illustrate that little progress has been made on some important goals of the forensic community. However, many other action items have received little or no attention. A portion of the responsibility for inaction or inability to meet the goals rests with each of us, individually. However, many actions require coordinated effort which can only be achieved through our organizational memberships.

¹⁷Mark Knapp, letter of August 7, 1989.

THE ORGANIZATIONS

The American Forensic Association

For many individuals the American Forensic Association is their primary professional association. Although an invaluable asset to the field of forensics, the AFA has experienced perceptual difficulties. In the Fall of 1972 Jerry Anderson noted

AFA represents to many an organization (sic) predominantly oriented to serve the well endowed programs focusing funds on a small elitist group of students who travel the 'national circuit' with the NDT as the ultimate goal.¹⁸

Four years later James Weaver commented

I would be less than honest if I did not report a certain pessimism about the American Forensic Association. Some are dissatisfied with actions, or lack of action, of the past and see little hope that AFA can achieve any noteworthy accomplishments in the future.¹⁹

Weaver went on to state that one of his goals as President was to establish the National Individual Events Tournament sponsored by the AFA and admits "...we are late with this proposal. But that does not mean we have forever missed the opportunity."²⁰

Conceived of at a meeting of debate coaches in the Fall of 1948,²¹ the AFA has a history of seeking to define its place in the forensic community.

In an attempt to define its role in August 1963, at the AFA meeting in Denver, Colorado, a Special Committee was appointed to Study Professional Standards (sic). The committee distributed and processed questionnaires which provided the raw material for establishing

¹⁸Anderson, 329.

¹⁹Weaver, 62.

²⁰Weaver, 62.

²¹Blyton, 13.

standards in the area of educational background and experience, employment and professional responsibility.²²

In 1972 emphasis shifted and one of the priorities identified for the Association was "Clarification of the status and relationship of AFA and SCA, maximizing the autonomy and interests of AFA while preserving compatible relationships with SCA."²³ On May 19, 1989 Bill Balthrop, concerned with the future role of the AFA, wrote "I will be contacting people next week-about serving on a "super-committee" to discuss some of these issues and try to see how we can shape, rather than react to, the changes taking place and the needs arising within the forensic community."²⁴

Many individuals feel that the American Forensic Association should be the umbrella organization of the forensic community. Balthrop indicated "Most of the questionnaires I received last year from AFA members indicate that the AFA should be that "broad umbrella" organization."²⁵ He continued "It may also be that the AFA cannot, or does not want to, assume this role because of other organizations' objections or because of its own determination about its role."²⁶ The current structure of the AFA precludes it from becoming the parent organization of the forensic community. By sponsoring the National Debate Tournament and the National Individual Events Tournament, the AFA cannot speak for the memberships of the National Forensic Association, the American Debate Association and the Cross Examination Debate Association. Thus, to become the "umbrella organization" the AFA would need to either incorporate organizations that currently maintain different orientations or divest itself of the NDT and the NIET. The feasibility and

²²Professional Standards: the Role of AFA," *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, III (September 1966), 116.

²³Anderson, 333.

²⁴Bill Balthrop, letter of May 19, 1989.

²⁵Balthrop letter.

²⁶Balthrop letter.

desirability of the AFA incorporating currently independent groups is doubtful. For the AFA to become congruent with other forensic organizations, it should consider divesting itself of the NDT/NIET. Tradition is the major justification for the AFA retaining these organizations. Another argument, financial in scope, carries much less weight. If there is a need for the NDT and the NIET as organizations, and there are good arguments to support the continuation of both, they would continue without the financial support of the AFA. A final argument, that the NDT and NIET achieves prestige by being sponsored by a professional association, deserves consideration. However, this argument is minimized when considering other organizations, such as CEDA and NFA, which have achieved prestige without that benefit. Additionally, the NDT and NIET will maintain their credibility because of the calibre of tournaments they offer. This credibility will exist with or without sponsorship by AFA.

Speech Communication Association-Forensic Division

Aside from serving as a liaison between the Speech Communication Association and the forensic community, the role of this group is ambiguous. The documents of the organization, aside from minutes of the early meetings, are not available. Balthrop commented

I used to believe that SCA was the most appropriate place for such leadership to come from (and that view was reflected, I think, by most others) hence, the decision to have the Chair of the SCA Forensic Division serve as Chair of the CFO. I no longer share that view -- partly as a result of better knowledge about how SCA works, partly as the result that I now believe that organization to be less important in the broad scheme of things. It still must exist, I think, but I don't see it as having leadership potential.²⁷

²⁷Balthrop letter.

A committee of this organization is exploring the role that it might play in the forensic community. Thus, the SCA Forensic Division is a second organization that is struggling to determine the role it should serve.

Council of Forensic Organizations

In 1987 Aden commented that "While the establishment of an umbrella Council of Forensic Organizations serves mostly a symbolic function, it is a necessary symbolic function in a field composed of so many different organizations and philosophies."²⁸

Created in 1984, the Council of Forensic Organizations consists of two representatives from each of the national competitively oriented forensic organizations on the high school, community college and university levels. Representation on the Council is not without inequity, however. According to the governance documents the American Forensic Association is entitled to two representatives on the Council. Even if these representatives are distributed with one from the NDT community and one from the NIET community, the representation of these two groups would not equal the representation of the other competitive organizations.

Designed as a forum for discussing the common problems of competitive forensic associations, the Council is assuming an increasingly important role in the forensic community. Last year the Council finalized the national tournament calendar and created the joint membership directory. A committee of that organization is currently considering membership equity, officer rotation and whether the Council should remain primarily an advisory group or assume a more active stance.

²⁸Aden, 105.

Currently the AFA, SCA-Forensic Division and the CFO are each reassessing the role that they will assume in the forensic macrostructure. Each has the opportunity to assume a major position. However, as currently structured, none are reaching their full potential. Balthrop commented

I believe that some overarching organization needs to exist .. but I am very skeptical about ... any group being able to serve the important functions that I believe are needed without some rather fundamental restructuring taking place. I also believe that whatever restructuring that takes place will need the unqualified support of the forensic organizations. Given our past record, I am somewhat doubtful of that, although I must admit to somewhat less pessimism than years past.²⁹

Perhaps Balthrop's pessimism stems from previous restructuring efforts. In 1965, recognizing the need for the AFA to be more responsive to high school coaches, a committee advocated internal restructuring of the AFA.³⁰ This group advocated a President, a Convention Program Planner, a Vice President for High School Affairs, A Vice President for College Affairs, a Secretary and a Treasurer. Committees were divided by the area to which they applied and included five general committees, five under the high school division and three under the college division.³¹

Inter-organizational restructuring was considered in 1972-1973. Boaz reported that the AFA and the SCA Forensic Division joint Committee to Explore the Possibility of Merger considered five options:

1. No merger; AFA not affiliate with SCA; AFA meet separately.
2. No merger; but AFA seek affiliate status with SCA.
3. Merge, but with understanding that AFA remain almost exclusively as is.

²⁹Balthrop letter.

³⁰Robert Huber, "Shall the American Forensic Association Be Restructured?" *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, II (September 1965), 92.

³¹Huber, "Shall the American Forensic Association Be Restructured?" 93.

4. Merge, but with minimal changes in AFA structure to achieve consistency with SCA Constitution.
5. Merge and seek major changes in AFA structure.³²

While working on the Constitutional Committee the year before Boaz had worked from the assumption that the merger would take place. However,

Council members expressed concern over the issue of the AFA autonomy, its officer composition, the publication of JAJFA and other sponsored publications, and the charging of dues, indicating that if AFA could not continue in these areas that merger would be undesirable.³³

When the committee report was presented, two recommendations were approved.

- 1) That AFA seek affiliate status with the Speech Communication Association.
- 2) That both AFA and the Forensic Division of SCA work to strengthen one another and support one another in developing programs and projects which will serve the forensic community.³⁴

THE GUIDELINES

The criteria that follow are based on the optimistic assumption that when goals are not being accomplished and when organizations are not functioning efficiently, rational individuals will seek a means to correct the problem. The guidelines for restructuring consists of an overview and two recommendations for maximizing the efficiency of organizational structuring.

Any reevaluation or restructuring cannot be successful unless the process is undertaken objectively. Cyert and March remind us "...that organizations are political in the sense that they have systems for allocating and using power and

³²Minutes of the 24th Annual American Forensic Association Meeting," 384.

³³"Minutes of AFA Meetings," *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, VIII (Winter 1972), 143.

³⁴"Minutes of the 24th Annual American Forensic Association Meeting," 384.

resources as well as ways of maintaining and protecting these systems. Political battles over resources and power often emerge when different groups or coalitions ... pursue conflicting objectives within the same organization."³⁵ Daniels and Spiker add "While the various groups that comprise an organization are bound together by some kind of common purpose, their specific interests are often in conflict."³⁶ A reexamination of forensic organizations will not yield any useful findings if engaged in from a territorial perspective in which decision makers are primarily concerned with preservation of the status quo. In reviewing the first National Developmental Conference of Forensics, Nobles indicates we must demonstrate willingness "...to accept criticisms of present forensic practices and to adopt motions to improve them"³⁷ as well as "...to endorse specific and controversial recommendations about forensic forms and practices."³⁸ These same attitudes must pervade any discussion of professional organizations. Assessing the effectiveness and efficiency of current organizations and the relationships between them will be unsuccessful unless undertaken constructively.

Two guidelines can insure that any reorganization attempt is conducted in a systematic and comprehensive manner. First, an organization should consider itself as a microstructure within a macrostructure. Wilson, Goodall and Waagen indicate "... no organizational environment exists in a vacuum. Organizations, and the persons within them, must learn to be responsive to the needs and expectations of the larger communities in which they reside and to the societies that sponsor

³⁵R.M. Cyert and J.C. March, *A Behavioral Theory of the Firm* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1963) in *Perspectives on Organizational Communication*, Tom Daniels and Barry Spiker (Dubuque, IA: Wm. C. Brown Publishers, 1987), 76.

³⁶Daniels and Spiker, 76.

³⁷Nobles, 75.

³⁸Nobles, 75.

them."³⁹ Thus, the organization should consider what position it seeks in the macrostructure. Positioning is "...the identity an organization wants perceived by its relevant publics..."⁴⁰ The initial question that must be asked is "What is it about ourselves or our products and services that we want people to perceive?"⁴¹ Goldhaber contends that positioning of both products and organizations could be the most important element in successful marketing today. "The ultimate goal of positioning is to create an image that will place the organization at its proper position within the market it serves."⁴² To correctly position itself within the macrostructure the organization must consider and stress its unique characteristics and positive aspects.⁴³

After considering the positioning of the organization within the macrostructure, the organization should determine its goals. Goodall defines a goal as "...what you want to have happen, an outcome, or an end product."⁴⁴ Brillhart echoes the importance of goals by saying "Lacking a common goal, progress is impossible."⁴⁵ The creation of the organization's goals should be undertaken with care. Bormann and Bormann caution "...if the goal is to be useful, it must be clearly specified and understood by all and it must be within reach."⁴⁶ Goodall advises "The

more precise the statement of the goal, the better are the chances of obtaining it."⁴⁷ When goals are vague or unreal, "...confusion, frustration and waste are the inevitable results..."⁴⁸ The goal created must not only be clearly understood and accepted by all members,⁴⁹ but "...should provide the individual group members with an idea of where the group should go, and how to get there through effective interaction."⁵⁰ Formulation of the goals should also be applied to subordinate groups. According to Brillhart "...no subordinate groups should be created (and the author would add or be retained) if there is not a real need for it a clear and understandable purpose to be accomplished."⁵¹

³⁹Gerald L. Wilson, H. Lloyd Goodall Jr. and Christopher L. Waagen, *Organizational Communication* (N.Y.: Harper and Row, 1983), 20.

⁴⁰Gerald Goldhaber, *Organizational Communication*, 4th ed. (Dubuque, IA: Wm. C. Brown Publishers, 1986), 336.

⁴¹Goldhaber, 336.

⁴² Goldhaber, 336.

⁴³Goldhaber, 336.

⁴⁴H. Lloyd Goodall Jr., *Small Group Communication in Organizations* (Dubuque, IA: Wm. C. Brown Publishers, 1985), 31.

⁴⁵John K. Brillhart, *Effective Group Discussion*, 4th ed. (Dubuque, IA: Wm. C. Brown Publishers, 1982), 42.

⁴⁶Ernest G. Bormann and Nancy C. Bormann, *Effective Small Group Discussion*, 4th ed. (Edina, MN: Burgess Publishing, 1988), 75.

⁴⁷Goodall, 33.

⁴⁸Brilhart, 42.

⁴⁹Brilhart, 237.

⁵⁰Goodall, 32.

⁵¹Brilhart, 42.

THE SUGGESTION

Although it is not the purpose of this paper to be prescriptive in whether or how the organizations will apply these guidelines or the role the organizations will ultimately assume, the suggestion of a possible model will be advanced.

Initially, the collegiate forensic community is too large and contains too many diverse units and organizations to remain loosely structured. Using the models of our high school counterparts, the collegiate forensic community needs to establish a national office. Complete with a salaried staff, the national office would provide a central coordinating body that could oversee and assist with coordinating forensic functions and organizations.

National Office

- Macrostructure Positioning:** Nonpolicy making, coordinating head of forensic community
- Possible General Goals:**
- To facilitate coordination of and between AFA, SCA-FD, CFO
 - To offer support services and assistance to AFA, SCA-FD, CFO
 - To assist with information dissemination on issues important to the forensic community at large
 - To direct inquiries to appropriate bodies To establish a unified dues statement

The AFA could be the research and public relations arm of the forensic community. Enhancing forensic scholarship by encouraging research might include conducting seminars and workshops to train forensic personnel in research techniques. The AFA could expand research opportunities both through *Argumentation and Advocacy: the Journal of the American Forensic Association* and by exploring means for insuring that research findings are integrated into forensic pedagogy. The AFA could enhance the visibility of forensics with society at large by

directing attention to political debates, international debates and applying forensics to such fields as politics, law and business. Also, external image enhancement might include lobbying State and national legislators. Additionally, this group might engage in public relations campaigns to strengthen the forensic image within the communication field.

AFA

- Macrostructure Positioning:** Research
External/Internal Public Relations
Pedagogical Issues
- Possible General Goals:**
- To encourage forensic research
 - To expand channels for scholarly research in forensics
 - To develop a resource cataloguing existing forensic research
 - To create a format for data exchange
 - To identify and disseminate information on editorial offices of journals that publish forensics related articles
 - To enhance computer literacy and forensic software availability
 - To develop professional lobbyists to advance forensic interests on the state and national levels
 - To open channel of communication and influence with public decision making bodies including public and private organizations
 - To enhance visibility of forensics by increasing public presentations in such areas as televised debates and public performances
 - To develop strategies to enhance the forensic image within Speech Communication Departments and the academic community as a whole
 - To disseminate information on the value of forensics
 - To initiate programs to promote forensic skills especially at the elementary and junior high school levels
 - To conduct workshops on new methodologies to strengthen forensic education

The Council of Forensic Organizations could continue in its role as the coordinator of competitive tournament events. The Council would be concerned with all items relating to tournament and competitive activities including those pedagogical concerns that relate specifically to coaching.

CFO

Macrostructure Positioning: Coordination of competitive forensic activities

- Possible General Goals:**
- To develop unified Code of Ethics for tournament competition
 - To investigate and explore innovative tournament models, including diversity of events
 - To establish educational objectives for tournament events to measure teaching effectiveness
 - To standardize events descriptions
 - To develop critical tools for adjudication
 - To develop assistance packages for new Directors of Forensics, publicity kits and materials for planning and executing tournaments
-

The Speech Communication Association-Forensic Division also has the opportunity to provide a necessary and valuable service for the forensic community. Perhaps the most obvious function that this organization can undertake is to strengthen the liason between the forensic community and the Speech Communication Association. Closely related to this role the Forensic Division could coordinate and strengthen convention program offerings. If the leadership of the Forensic Division consisted of the officers of AFA and the CFO, this organization could serve as a forum where the theoretical and practical aspects of the discipline could merge.

SCA-FD

Macrostructure Positioning: SCA Liason

- Possible General Goals:**
- To seek methods to strengthen relationships between the forensic community and SCA
 - To coordinate programs of all forensic organizations at SCA Conventions
-

Utilizing this model, the organizational chart for the forensic community would be:

As indicated at the outset, this model is advisory. A synthesis of numerous issues the forensic community generated as action items fall into the categories of research, internal and external public relations, programming, pedagogical and tournament issues. Delegating specific functions to associations would not only

assure a clear line of responsibility but could assist in the actual accomplishment of objectives.

Whether this or an alternate pattern is adopted, restructuring forensic associations is mandated by the lack of progress toward established goals. At minimum a committee must be established consisting of leaders from AFA, SCA-FD and the CFO. The charge of this group should be to make recommendations for restructuring the macrostructure of the forensic community. These suggestions should seek to enhance the effectiveness and efficiency of the forensic field. Scott Noble's concluding remarks in his Report from the President are as applicable today as when they were written sixteen years ago.

If the forensic community will unite to meet its problems and if it can follow through successfully on work already commenced ... the challenges we face can be matched by the progress which we achieve.⁵²

⁵²Nobles, 76.

Mentoring activities and programs have gained increasing attention and endorsement in a variety of business and academic areas. This paper proceeded with the premise that mentoring may possess untapped potential for the forensic community. Starting with a survey of experienced and novice coaches to assess the existence of and attitudes toward mentoring activities, the paper then moves to conclusions and recommendations for the expanded use of mentoring as a method to advance or promote our forensic coaches and judges.

Mentoring Relationships and Programs: Applications to the Forensics Community

Cynthia R. Carver
and
Cindy Larson-Casselton
Concordia College

Introduction

In the last fifteen years, mentoring has emerged as a topic of interest in a variety of areas ranging from academics to business to groups at risk. While interest in mentoring is a fairly recent development, the concept itself is really quite old. Noonan (1980) suggests that Greek mythology was probably the first to introduce the term. "Mentor" was a faithful friend of Odysseus who was entrusted to care for Odysseus' son. When Odysseus set off on his ten-year odyssey, Mentor was the one who educated, counselled and sponsored his son, Telemachus. It is from Greek mythology that a mentor came to be known as a trusted counselor or guide. History contains many other examples of famous mentoring relationships. Merriam (1983) suggests such examples as: Socrates and Plato, Freud and Jung, Lorenzo de Medici and Michelangelo, Haydn and Beethoven, Boas and Mead, and Sartre and De Beauvoir. This historical framework also, in the words of Merriam

(1983), leads us to regard a mentor as "one who is trusted, loving, and experienced in the guidance of the younger. The mentor helps shape the growth and development of the protege" (p. 162).

The recent interest in mentoring can be traced in part to a survey published by Roche in the Harvard Business Review in 1979. Over 4,000 top executives in the United States were interviewed concerning their experiences with mentoring relationships. Over two-thirds of those interviewed reported involvement in mentoring relationships. Additionally, those executives who had mentors were found to: (1) earn more money at a younger age; (2) were better educated; (3) were more likely to follow a "career plan"; (4) sponsor more proteges; and (5) they reported being happier with their careers and deriving greater pleasure from their work. Alleman, Cochran, Doverspike, and Newnan (1984) report that documented benefits of mentoring for individuals and organizations include: faster promotion, higher pay, greater technical and organizational knowledge, and higher levels of productivity and performance for both mentor and protege. It is probably not surprising that such findings have encouraged not only research work in the area of mentoring, but also the establishment of a variety of formal and informal mentoring programs in business and academic areas.

This paper is interested in addressing two questions. First, to what extent do mentoring relationships exist in the forensics community? Second, would it be desirable for the forensics community to formally or informally encourage mentoring relationships, practices, or programs? Organizationally, the paper will be divided into three sections. First, basic definitions of and approaches to mentoring will be presented. Second, a summary of semi-nondirected interviews with forensics coaches from one region of the country concerning their experiences with and thoughts about mentoring will be provided. Finally, conclusions and recommendations will be offered as to how the forensics community can use

mentoring practices and procedures to enhance the training and development of new coaches and judges.

Definitions and Approaches

A review of the mentoring literature quickly reveals that mentoring has been defined in a variety of ways. Levinson et. al. (1978) offer one of the most restricted definitions, suggesting: (1) that a mentor is a teacher, sponsor, counselor, developer of skills and intellect, host, guide and example; (2) that a mentor's most crucial function is to support and facilitate the realization of a dream; (3) that a mentor synthesizes the characteristics of a parent-child relationship and peer support without being either; and (4) that a mentor relationship is an intense form of "love," that lasts two or three years (at most ten) and possesses an 8-15 year age difference between mentor and protege. Roche (1979), on the other hand, defines a mentor as someone who takes a personal interest in a person's career or who guides or sponsors a person. For the purposes of this paper, mentoring will be defined as "a relationship in which a person of greater rank, experience, or expertise teaches, guides, and develops a novice in an organization or profession" (Alleman, Cochran, Doverspike and Newnan, 1984, p. 327).

Actual applications of mentoring in the business, academic and adult development areas indicate further that it is possible to operationally view mentoring in two ways. Daloz (1986) uses a travel metaphor to distinguish the two approaches. First, a mentor can be viewed as one who makes a map for the protege. The mentor knows all the right people and the right paths to take. The mentor is a tour guide who has the travel tips necessary to smooth out a lot of bumps on a person's professional road. It is also possible, however, to view a mentor as a trusted guide who is more interested in developing the traveler than in fixing the road. The ultimate goal is to help to assure that the protege becomes a competent

traveler who can traverse assorted roads in the future. For the purposes of this paper, mentoring will be examined from both points of view: a person who knows the ropes and can acquaint and promote the protege and/or a person who develops the protege. A forensics mentor, thus, might be a person who supplies information to newer coaches about tournament practices and procedures, who introduces newer coaches to other coaches, who helps to develop the self-confidence of newer coaches, who promotes newer coaches to administrators on their own campuses, who helps newer coaches to develop ethical and philosophical positions related to the activity, etc.

We were interested initially in trying to ascertain the prevalence and nature of mentoring relationships in the forensics community. Given time constraints, it was decided to conduct semi-nondirected interviews with a limited sample of established and novice forensics coaches.

Methodology

A telephone survey of five experienced and five novice coaches was conducted using coaches from one of the AFA-designated forensics districts. A telephone survey was used to allow for a more lengthy interview with respondents. The survey began by providing the definition of mentoring -- a relationship in which a person of greater rank, experience or expertise teaches, guides or develops a novice in an organization or profession. With this definition in mind, a different set of open-ended questions was asked of each group of coaches.

Survey Findings and Discussion

Novice coach responses will be given first followed by the responses from the experienced coaches.

Question 1: Do you feel that you had a mentor when you started coaching forensics, and, if so, what kinds of things did this person do for you?

Answers from the novice coaches proved to be very interesting. All respondents answered yes to this question, with one coach stating that her mentor did not come from her own school, but rather from the surrounding area. In terms of what kinds of things this person did, there were a variety of responses:

- * My mentor first and foremost trusted me.
- * My mentor was willing to talk issues over with me, both good and bad.
- * My mentor helped me to develop my own coaching techniques.
- * My mentor showed me how to administer tournaments and work with a budget.
- * My mentor made a special effort to introduce me to people in the district.
- * My mentor was an important individual for me to bounce ideas off of.

Question 2: How important to your satisfaction and/or success in coaching was having this mentor?

The immediate response to this question was "a lot." When asked to assign a percentage to the question, most of the coaches responded fifty percent. One of the novice coaches went so far as to say, "I'm not sure I would have known what to do and I'm not sure I would have even been hired."

Question 3: What would have made things easier for you as you began coaching?

Those interviewed had a lot of advice pertaining to the preceding question. Most of their comments could be associated with "fitting in" kinds of issues and information seeking.

- * It would have helped if I would have had a reputation myself.

* I had low self-confidence when I began coaching. More people coming forth with information or offering information would have been beneficial.

* Feeling more like I belonged. I almost felt like I had the label "new coach" tattooed on my forehead.

* A guidebook containing a description of what all the different organizations had to offer.

* A booklet containing coaching and judging tips.

* Help with planning and fighting for a budget.

* A description of what tournaments are on the "regular" circuit.

* Help in dealing with my department's and administration's expectations.

Question 4: What would you like to see happen for other new coaches?

Answers to question number four were closely related to the comments which were received for question number three. The novice coaches did, however, provide a variety of responses for what they would like to see done for new coaches in the forensics community.

* More easily accessible workshops which aren't so far away.

* A pamphlet which explains what all of the acronyms mean; for example: AFA, PKD, NFA, etc.

* A description of what the specific guidelines are for the different individual events. For example, can a student use his or her original work?

* A list of burned out topics, authors and titles.

* Help in administering a high school or college tournament.

* A personal invitation to coaches' parties.

* A call from the district chairperson welcoming them to the district.

* It is important to "hear" the ideas of new coaches when they offer suggestions.

Question 5: How would you feel if a more formal program of mentoring was established for novice coaches?

All of the novice coaches interviewed felt that a more formalized process would be very helpful for new coaches. The following suggestions were offered and can be divided into the areas of developing specific relationships for novice coaches, providing specific and helpful information, and the national offices also doing their part for the novice coaches.

- * Perhaps the establishment of a buddy system with a coach in the near vicinity to help answer questions which a novice coach may have.
- * Ask for experienced coaches to volunteer to welcome and to help new coaches to fit in.
- * Provide a sheet which would contain the names, phone numbers and addresses of all the coaches in the area.
- * A pamphlet or workshop which would address a variety of questions which might most often be asked by novice coaches.
- * A space which would be provided by the national offices which could be checked by new coaches when paying dues. Someone should be appointed by the national offices to contact new coaches and welcome them to the forensics community.

The more experienced coaches in our survey were asked the same first and second questions as the novice coaches, but the other questions were different.

Question 1: Do you feel that you had a mentor when you started coaching forensics, and, if so, what kinds of things did this person do for you?

Question 2: How important to your satisfaction and/or success in coaching was having a mentor?

Answers to experienced coaches to the first two questions did not differ significantly from those of the novice coaches; however, a difference was noted in their extended responses to what they felt their mentor had done for them. It was also interesting to note that most experienced coaches responded that they still felt that their mentor was a part of their coaching. Common responses to question number one included:

- * This person gave me my coaching head, and he let me do my own coaching.
- * My mentor presented me with options. He didn't tell, but he gave advice and direction.
- * My mentor was heavy on encouragement and low on discouragement.
- * My mentor allowed me to learn from my mistakes.
- * My mentor taught me the nontangible "stuff" like how to create harmony among my team members.
- * To this day I play the "what if" game with my mentor as I explore my coaching abilities.
- * My mentor helped me with planning my budget and tournament administration.
- * My mentor introduced me to others in the district and helped me plan my travel schedule.

The main difference for question two was that the more experienced coaches stressed a higher percentage (seventy-five to eighty percent) of their satisfaction and/or success in coaching was due to their mentor/protégé relationships.

Question 3: Do you feel that you've served as a mentor for others, and, if so, how was this relationship established?

Most coaches felt that they had served as a mentor to others. When asked how this relationship developed, most felt that either because of their position or reputation they were more likely to be sought out by the protégés. A few examples

were also given where the experienced coaches felt that they had gone out of their way to establish a mentoring relationship with a new coach. Interestingly, most of the experienced coaches definitely felt that they fulfilled the mentor role for their students.

Question 4: What kinds of things do you feel that you have done for your proteges?

The general response of "mainly the same kinds of things that my mentor did for me" was given most often; however, when probed a bit further, most of the reactions to this question dealt with more philosophical and morale-building concerns.

- * I helped them to generate their own philosophy toward coaching.
- * I allowed them as much freedom as they could deal with at the time.
- * I helped them to realize that it was okay to question a decision that they had made while judging.
- * I complimented, complimented, complimented.

Interestingly, few of the responses received from experienced coaches discussed "showing the ropes" types of things to novice coaches.

Question 5: What kinds of things are you aware of that are happening in your district or in the country to help to mentor new coaches?

The above question was asked to provide a clearer picture of what might already be happening to provide a more formal approach to mentoring. The answer to this question was most often phrased negatively. For example:

- * Not enough.
- * I'm not aware of anything.
- * Absolutely nothing. We are supportive informally but not formally.
- * More seems to be being done on the high school level than on the collegiate level.

Most coaches did feel that the NFA and PKD journals were doing a good job of offering articles which help give information to new coaches.

Question 6: What recommendations do you have either formally or informally for creating a mentoring model for forensics?

Several recommendations were given by the more experienced coaches for setting up a mentoring model. Most felt quite strongly that the model should not cause us to lose informality, but that it would be very helpful for the forensics education of our novice coaches if something more formal were to be put into place. Some of the suggestions were as follows:

- * A mentor has to give the protege a sense of self-esteem and accomplishment, not just information.
- * A mentor should affirm the person's professionalism.
- * Information should be offered by the mentor which cannot be learned in the classroom; for example, how to fight for a budget, training in administrative duties, and the interpersonal encounters one might come up against.
- * Training is needed for ethical concerns of coaches and students.
- * There should be the development of a forensics glossary that would explain what all of the acronyms stand for and mean.
- * Provide an autobiography of all the coaches in the district or state; for example, include name, school, years of coaching, forensics offices held, education, etc.
- * Prepare a bibliography of helpful forensics texts or articles.
- * The district chairperson could make a phone call to welcome the new coaches in the district.
- * A newsletter with names, phone numbers and mailing addresses could be sent to everyone in the district, province or state.

• Perhaps at a tournament or coaches' party, there could be an open discussion for all coaches on a topic like "what are we going to do to continue to grow as coaches."

Conclusions and Recommendations

Before proceeding to any conclusions or recommendations about mentoring in the forensics community, it is important to note that questions and concerns do exist about the mentoring research and literature published to date. Merriam's critical review of the mentoring literature (1983) suggests that a number of problems with research designs make any possible conclusions about the importance and effects of mentoring tenuous at best. She includes among the concerns: the use of varying conceptual and operational definitions of the mentoring construct, making comparison of research findings difficult; the fact that different research methods such as surveys versus interviews appear to produce different research findings; that limited research designs, mainly surveys, have been used with limited samples, often successful executives; and the existence of tenuous links between the existence of mentoring relationships and conclusions about the effects of those relationships.

Others have suggested that possible drawbacks or dangers of mentoring relationships have also not received enough attention in the research and literature (Levison, et. al., 1978). Dangers suggested include mentors who are exploitive, stifling or over-protective, the potential for the mentor to lose power or prestige as a result of the mentoring relationship, or dependencies that may develop in the protege.

Overall, however, the literature appears biased in favor of mentoring relationships. (Wilbur 1987) Any effort to formalize mentoring in the forensics community should, however, clearly be aware of potential problems with mentoring

relationships and be committed to the review of any mentoring efforts or programs to assess effects and desirability.

Based upon our reading of the mentoring literature, our experience as forensics coaches, and our interviews with experienced and novice coaches about their mentoring relationships, we offer the following conclusions and recommendations.

First, it appears that the answer to the first question posed by this study is affirmative. Mentoring relationships do exist in the forensics community. Experienced and novice coaches alike indicate the prevalence of mentors in their coaching careers. All of the interviews for this study were conducted in just one part of the country, so there is the potential question of whether other parts of the country mirror our findings. Geographic dispersion, the number of new coaches versus experienced coaches in a particular region, or the degree of competitiveness in a region might all be factors that would influence the existence and nature of mentoring relationships.

Second, although both experienced and novice coaches appeared to recognize the desirability of mentoring relationships, they differed in the degree of that recognition. Experienced coaches seemed to associate more activities and more variety of activities with mentoring. Additionally, more experienced coaches attributed more of their success as coaches to their mentoring relationships than did novice coaches. We can only speculate on the reasons for these differences. It may be that mentoring relationships are not as strong or productive today as they were a few years ago. It may be that novice coaches have less need than their predecessors for mentors, although their interview responses do not tend to support this conclusion. Or it may simply be that novice coaches have not at present benefitted completely from their mentoring relationships or come to realize the full impact mentoring has on their coaching satisfaction and success.

Third, experienced and novice coaches seemed to gravitate to different operational definitions of mentoring. Experienced coaches tended to see themselves and their mentors as trusted guides whose main goal was to develop the newer traveler on the forensics circuit. Novice coaches, on the other hand, seemed first and foremost to be seeking a mentor who would make a map for them and smooth out some of the bumps on the road to entering this profession. It is probably not surprising that "learning the ropes" may take precedence for new coaches trying to "survive" their entry into the forensics profession, but the difference in orientation between experienced and novice coaches may clearly have implications for program development.

Fourth, the answer to the second question posed by our study also appears to be affirmative. It is desirable for the forensics community to formally and informally encourage mentoring relationships, practices and programs. Although both sets of coaches recognized the value of informal approaches to mentoring, and although both sets of coaches did not want informal mentoring practices to suffer as a result of the development of more formal programs, there was a clear consensus that the forensics community should follow the lead of the business community and establish some formal mentoring programs. Wilbur (1989) reports that over one-third of all major companies in this country have now established some type of formal mentoring program.

Fifth, it seems clear to the researchers, although not mentioned by the interviewees, that the uneven distribution of men and women in the coaching profession may impact upon the existence, nature and success of mentoring relationships for women coaches. A concern of the mentoring research in business has frequently been the dearth of female mentors for up and coming businesswomen. (Sheehy, 1974) Bolton (1980) argues that women in business have traditionally had limited access to mentoring relationships and have, as a result,

suffered by comparison with their male counterparts in the areas of advancement and promotion. If the mentoring literature from business can be applied to the forensics community, it may suggest that special attention may need to be paid to fostering mentoring relationships for novice female coaches and to encouraging male experienced coaches to sponsor female as well as male proteges.

We make the following recommendations for consideration and discussion by the forensics community.

Recommendation 1: Move to establish, through existing forensics organizations, formal mentoring programs.

The previous summary of interviews provides ample idea of the types of activities that could be sponsored by a more formal mentoring program. The addition of a formal mentoring program would appear to have several advantages. First, a formal program helps to assure that all novice coaches who could benefit from mentoring relationships are reached. Current informal practices may limit the development of mentor relationships to those individuals who feel confident and comfortable enough to seek out such relationships, to individuals in areas of the country where mentors are geographically available or willing to volunteer as mentors, and to male versus female coaches who are more readily sought out or accepted as proteges.

Second, a more formal mentoring program would help to assure that the full range of mentoring activities is more likely to take place. Novice coaches tend to want mentors to teach them the ropes. Experienced coaches tend to want to develop the person. Both are needed and valuable. A formal program helps to bring to light the range of mentoring activities that are available and needed and helps to develop an appreciation for the full range of activities on the part of both mentors and proteges.

Third, a formal mentoring program enhances the possibilities for and probability of formal evaluation and review of mentoring activities. Given the research indictments and potential problems with mentoring relationships cited earlier, such review procedures would seem desirable.

Our home state of Minnesota provides an example of a formal program that has been instituted by high school debate coaches. First, every effort is made during the summer or early fall to identify and contact all new coaches in the state. A desire to make new coaches feel welcome as well as a desire to make offers of help available immediately underlie the contacts. In the fall, a three-day workshop for new coaches is offered with the cost being underwritten by the state high school debate association. Experienced coaches in the state donate their time to work at the workshop. "Learning the ropes" types of information, valued so highly by new coaches, are provided, but opportunity to interface with experienced coaches and initiate mentoring relationships is also provided. Additionally, the high school association publishes a booklet with valuable coaching and judging information and distributes videotapes that contain examples of contest events and coaching advice. One high school coach, in explaining their program, remarked, "We realize that this activity is only as strong as its coaches. We need to do a better job of recruiting new coaches, but, additionally, we must maintain our new coaches by helping to assure their success and satisfaction. We can only do that by making sure that the skills, talents and abilities of new coaches are optimized."

We will refrain from offering suggestions as to what a college forensics mentoring program should be. If formal mentoring programs are to meet the needs of newer coaches and gain the acceptance and support of both experienced and novice coaches, we suggest it is essential that these programs be developed via a planning process that incorporates experienced and novice coaches as well as representatives from the sponsoring forensics organizations.

Recommendation 2: Move to retain and expand the existence of informal mentoring practices and procedures.

The only drawback to the establishment of more formal mentoring programs cited by our interviewees was the potential that such programs could inhibit or detract from the already-existent informal mentoring practices. The mentoring literature cited earlier indicates that both mentor and protege benefit from mentoring relationships. Informal mentoring practices allow the opportunity for anyone who desires to serve in a mentoring role. It is important also that if formal programs are put into place that experienced coaches not start to assume that all mentoring needs are now being fulfilled. Novice coaches made it very clear in our interviews that they value the informal mentoring practices and do not want to lose them.

Recommendation 3: Expand the promotion function which mentoring can serve for less experienced forensics coaches.

Mentoring in the business profession frequently concentrates on the promotion and advancement of proteges by their mentors. Interviews with both experienced and novice forensics coaches did not isolate this as a primary mentoring function in the forensics community. We would recommend that formal programs and informal practices give more emphasis to the promotion function of mentoring for novice forensics coaches.

First, mentors need to promote new coaches on their home campuses. Members of their home departments as well as administrators on their campuses need to be made aware of the accomplishments of their new forensics faculty members. This function is especially important for new coaches who are coaching alone at their school or who are on campuses where other department members or administrators are not familiar with the forensics activity. Budget decisions, as

well as renewal, tenure and promotion decisions for new coaches, are all tied to the degree to which new coaches have been promoted on their own campuses.

Second, newer coaches need to be promoted in terms of offices and committee assignments in our established forensics organizations. Such positions allow increased opportunities for newer coaches to interface with more experienced coaches and, hence, promote mentoring relationships. Opportunities to serve in such positions also enhance the status of newer coaches on their home campuses, and, of course, our forensics organizations would clearly benefit from the ideas that would be presented from the perspectives of newer coaches.

Conclusion

This paper has attempted to investigate the potential of mentoring relationships and programs for the forensics community. It is the opinion of the authors that, although mentoring is appropriate for our profession, it is an under-utilized method of training and developing forensics coaches to date. We encourage forensics coaches and established forensics organizations to initiate discussions that would plan for the development and extension of mentoring practices and programs.

REFERENCES

- Alleman, E., Cochran, J., Doverspike, J., and Newnan, I. (1984). *Enriching mentoring relationships*. *The Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 62, 329-332.
- Bolton, E.B. (1990). *A conceptual analysis of the mentor relationship in the career development of women*. *Adult Education*, 30, 195-207.
- Daloz, L.A. (1986). *Effective teaching and mentoring*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.
- Levinson, D.J. et. al. (1978). *The seasons of a man's life*. New York: Ballantine Books.
- Merriam, S. (1983). *Mentors and proteges: A critical review of the literature*. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 33, 161-173.

- Noonan, J.F. (1980). *New directions for teaching and learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.
- Roche, G.D. (1979). *Much ado about mentors*. *The Harvard Business Review*, 20, 14-28.
- Sheehy, G. (1976, April 15). *The mentor connection: The secret link in the successful woman's life*. *New York Magazine*, 33-39.
- Sheehy, G. (1974). *Predictable crises in adult life*. New York: E.P. Dutton and Company.
- Wilbur, J. (1989). *Does mentoring breed success?* *Training and Development Journal*, 41, 38-41.

A Question of Oral Questions: Why Aren't Judges Allowed to Query Competitors?

Erik T. Kanter
San Diego State University

When he was expected to use his mind, he felt like a right-handed person who has to do something with his left.
-- Georg Christoph Lichtenberg

When I ran across this quotation in an impromptu round, it seemed to me very applicable to what I believe is currently a major problem in individual events competition -- not allowing nor rewarding competitors for using critical thinking, reasoning and interpersonal communication skills. While forensics experience does, and should, provide training and practice in the skills that constitute effective public communication,¹ it should also provide training and practice in the skills that constitute effective thinking, reacting and responding. Since the latter skills are not required to achieve success in competition, persons involved in individual events seldom get the chance to employ and cultivate these highly desirable talents. I propose that we should encourage individual events competitors to develop and improve the aforementioned skills, and that the best way to do this is to allow judges the option of oral questioning following an individual's performance. Questioning will not only allow for the enhancement and expansion of a competitor's communicative abilities, it will also provide additional benefits for the

¹James. H. McBath, "Toward A Rationale for Forensics," In D. Parson (Ed.), *American Forensics in Perspective: Papers from the Second National Conference on Forensics* (Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association, 1985), p. 6.

competitor as well as offer advantages for the critic/judge and for forensics in general.

In the following paper I will: first, examine both the potential benefits and disadvantages of allowing the option of oral questioning; second, show how questioning can be integrated into the judging of individual events; and, finally, propose a timetable and an agenda for integration both at the local and national levels.

Benefits of Oral Questioning

For the individual events competitor, there are numerous benefits involved in allowing oral questioning.

First, it gives competitors the opportunity to enhance their overall education. Questioning will encourage competitors to become highly knowledgeable in their subject areas, thus leading to a deeper and more thorough understanding of that specific topic. Questioning will offer individual events participants an opportunity to develop communicative skills that are highly valued by society. Questioning will provide useful career preparation by giving individuals a chance to enhance and improve impromptu public speaking skills. Learning how to answer queries succinctly and directly is a highly desired skill for professions such as education, law, politics and business.

Second, questioning will afford an opportunity for individuals to respond to their judges. The chance to answer a question will allow an immediate and direct response to any potential misunderstanding or concern that a judge may have concerning the individual's performance before the final ranking of the round.

Third, questioning provides an opportunity for further distinction between those competitors who have done significant research and truly understand and can discuss their topic area and those competitors who have been lax in terms of

research and whose knowledge of their topic area goes little beyond what is contained in their speech.

For the individual events critic/judge, there are also many advantages in being given the opportunity to ask a question following an individual's performance.

First, it gives the critic/judge a chance to test competitors when there is sufficient doubt about the individual's knowledge or understanding of their topic.

Second, it allows the critic/judge to clear up any minor misunderstandings or concerns and get clarifications prior to the final ranking of the round.

Third, it provides the critic/judge with another determining factor and justification for ranking when all other factors are considered equal.

Fourth, it encourages critic/judges to listen more carefully and critically to competitors' speeches.

Fifth, since the role of the individual events judge is as an educator/critic,² questioning will better enhance and emphasize that role in the tournament setting.

Finally, it has been argued that judges incur certain responsibilities by their acceptance of the task and that judges are obligated to provide adequate and constructive written comments to explain a student's ranking.³ Not only will competitors' responses to queries enhance the chance for more and better comments, it should also allow the ballot to be used more effectively. Space would not need to be taken up by questions and concerns that could be easily answered, and, instead the limited ballot space could be used for more useful criticism.

For individual events, as a whole, there are also many long-term benefits of oral questioning.

²John Murphy, "Order and Diversity: The Search for Judging Standards in Individual Events," In D. Parson (Ed.), *American Forensics in Perspective: Papers from the Second National Conference on Forensics* (Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association, 1985), p. 91.

³Murphy, p. 89.

First, it would provide the opportunity to produce better researchers and more highly educated and skilled participants. Although a forensics program is inherently interdisciplinary, forensics does share the intellectual concerns and pedagogical goals of the field of speech communication. Research, analysis, and effective expression are central to the mission of communication study as well as to forensics education.⁴ Thus, many of those currently involved in our discipline, as well as many of those who eventually will become involved in the discipline, have come from, or will come from, forensics backgrounds. Better educated and skilled competitors help insure a bright future for the discipline.

Second, it helps to ensure that ethical standards are strictly followed. The potential of being asked a question should reduce the incidents of where some or much of the speech is researched and/or written by someone other than the individual delivering it. The potential for judges' queries would also make competitors more directly responsible for what they say since they could be questioned or called on it publicly and immediately.

Third, it will provide the opportunity to reward those individuals who are both excellent and ethical researchers and talented public speakers. Although the instances have probably been few, undoubtedly some of the most highly recognized speeches have been delivered by individuals who have committed ethical violations or simply never became truly knowledgeable in a topic area in which they were assumed to be an expert. Questioning could help reduce those situations by forcing competitors to achieve some level of expertise in their subject area. This would also send the message to future competitors that being an ethical, knowledgeable and skilled communicator is the way to achieve success in individual events.

⁴McBath, p. 7.

questions are allowed or not. We cannot expect individuals to pass judgment, write constructive and relevant comments, and potentially ask an intelligent question about an event that they do not fully understand or for which they do not know the requirements.

Second, the forensics community should begin educating judges about the types of questions that are acceptable to ask and the lines of questioning that would be inappropriate. This information could be included in the judging seminar before each tournament as well as discussed at national and regional meetings before the tournament season begins. It has been recommended that if a judge decides to ask a question, s/he should abide by the following three points: 1) The question should be on the subject of the speech, 2) The question should be as brief and clear as possible, and 3) The question should be reasonable.⁷

Third, coaches and tournaments must let competitors know that questioning will be available to the judge and that responses can be a determining factor in the individual's rank. While I see nothing wrong with judges being allowed to ask questions immediately, that information should be listed in the event descriptions and tournament rules so that competitors will not be surprised or able to argue ignorance when posed with a question following their performances.

Fourth, it must be made clear that by no means is questioning mandatory and that questioning should only be employed when the judge feels it is warranted. The question should be a useful tool, but not an overused one. A question should only refer to material that the judge is either confused or unclear about and that is important in the determination of the individual competitor's rank. I would expect that certain judges would ask questions frequently while many others seldom or never at all. Some may find questioning useful, others unnecessary or even

⁷Donald W. Klopff & Stanley G. Rives, *Individual Speaking Contents: Preparation for Participation* (Minneapolis, MN: Burgess, 1966), pp. 67-68.

bothersome, but at least it will be an available option for those wishing to take advantage of it.

Fifth, it must be requested that judges ask questions that can be answered in a limited period of time. The entire process of questioning and response should seldom exceed a minute and should rarely ever exceed three minutes.⁸ I would not necessarily mandate that a judge be limited to only a single question; that would simply create more confusing multiple-part questions. The only requirement should be that the entire questioning process be handled expediently.

Finally, it must be emphasized that questioning does not mean debating or interrogating and that unless confusion arises there should be no oral comments about a competitor's response by the judge. There also should be no cross questioning. Additionally, when a competitor has finished the response no further exchange should take place.

Agenda

With the elimination this past year of allowing questions following a Rhetorical Criticism at NFA Nationals, neither of the national tournaments currently allow the option of oral questioning in any individual event. While public address events would seem the more likely choices to allow questions, I believe every individual event should permit them. Public address events involve rhetorical, research, analysis and organization skills to emphasize the persuasion of audiences.⁹ As a judge is considered a member of the audience, they should be allowed to question and orally address their persuader if they feel a query is called for. Oral interpretation events also can lend themselves to questions. Since the

⁸This assumes a round where there is a single judge. Final rounds and elimination rounds at National where multiple judges are involved would increase the time needed for questioning.

⁹McBath, p. 11.

Finally, the experience of responding to queries will enhance and expand a competitor's overall education in communication and improve skills needed in many speaking situations. This is highly desired since individual events tournaments are educational laboratories for increasing the understanding of, appreciation for, and skill in the art of public speaking.⁵

Disadvantages of Oral Questioning

While the potential benefits of allowing questioning are numerous, there are some potential disadvantages which must be considered.

The first, and primary, problem that questioning potentially creates is the time factor. Tournaments are frequently hindered due to the lack of available time. Rounds often run overtime, causing late nights and two-hour delays in awards assemblies. The work group on individual events at The Second National Conference on Forensics noted that the tight schedules of many tournaments pose problems for adequate criticism by limiting time for ballot writing and judge-contestant interaction.⁶ Time is a major concern. I would argue, however, that allowing the option of oral questioning would lengthen the time of a round negligibly or not at all. Many tournaments allow an hour and a half between rounds. Questioning could potentially extend a round anywhere from 0 to 15 minutes. Assuming a worst-case scenario of an additional 15 minutes, rounds would still be able to be completed in the hour and a half time block. Upon closer inspection, though, it seems that the time needed to ask questions is already currently available, and we are simply not taking advantage of it. It has been my experience that much more time is lost because of multiple entries and not having

⁵Murphy, p. 90.

⁶Ibid., p. 88.

speakers available than in not having enough time for the speeches themselves. Frequently, there is more than enough time between speeches (when a judge is waiting for a multiple entrant) that could be used for questions. Questioning is certainly more productive and educationally rewarding than staring at the walls. Tournaments can and should make better use of the time available. Thus, I do not believe that the time factor is an extremely valid or significant argument against the option of oral questioning. Questioning may add little or no time at all to a round, and, even if it did mean adding 10 to 15 minutes to a round and an extra hour to a tournament, the potential benefits for those involved in individual events would far outweigh the minor extra cost of time.

A second potential problem that questioning could create is the abuse of the privilege by certain judges. Unfortunately, not every judge who walks into an individual events round is qualified to judge that event. Assuming the judge does not have the experience to critique the round, obviously that person would not have the experience to ask appropriate questions. There also is the concern that judges may use questions as a tool to embarrass or intentionally degrade a competitor. Unfortunately, some improper questioning is inevitable, just as some unethical and inappropriate judging is inevitable. All we can do is address those situations when they arise and assure competitors that any unethical judging or questioning will be addressed immediately and appropriately.

Integration

I believe that questioning can be smoothly integrated into the judging of individual events if specific steps are taken and certain procedures are followed.

First, tournaments should hold a brief judging seminar before competition begins so that all judges will be familiar with the events that they will be critiquing. This is primarily for hired judges and really should be taking place whether

oral interpretation of literature requires that competitors understand literary analysis, history, the emotional and intellectual aspects of literature, and effective expression,¹⁰ students should be able to respond intelligently to queries concerning those aspects of their performance.

While I eventually hope that questioning will be both allowed and accepted during judging of every individual event, I realize that some may feel that such immediate integration would be too drastic. Thus, I propose that the following steps be taken so that questioning can be smoothly, but eventually completely, integrated into individual events tournaments.

First, I would like to see a work group put together at the national level to discuss and debate the best way to integrate questioning into individual events tournaments.

Second, I would reiterate that questions could be of value in all individual events, including interpretation events, but are especially necessary in two events in particular: Rhetorical Criticism/CA and Extemporaneous Speaking.

Third, before questioning is accepted at local tournaments it will have to be integrated into the two national tournaments. As a first step, I'd like to see questioning allowed in all elimination rounds at NFA and AFA Nationals. Assuming that individuals who make "out rounds" are the best speakers in the country in a given event, they should be highly knowledgeable about their topic and very qualified to field questions concerning their program. Also, time is not a major factor by the time elimination rounds at Nationals come along; thus, the time factor would essentially be eliminated. Finally, theoretically some of the highest qualified judges available are judging elimination rounds at Nationals: judges and coaches who have extensive experience and are some of the most prominent individuals in

¹⁰Ibid., p. 11.

the field. I'm confident that very few people would feel that these individuals would be unable to ask a necessary and appropriate question.

If integrated at both national tournaments, eventually the concept of allowing oral questions would trickle down to other regional and local competitions. Since one of the primary goals of regional and local tournaments is to get competitors ready for Nationals, allowing questioning would be mandatory preparation and practice for those who might eventually succeed at the national level.

Finally, after adequate experimentation, I would like to see the option of questioning included in all rounds at every individual events competition.

Summary

After examining the pros and cons of oral questioning, it appears that the option of judges' queries brings with it many benefits that could enhance individual events competition, both for the competitor and for the critic/judge. Questioning can be smoothly and easily integrated into the judging of individual events and should be done so as soon as possible to ensure that the individual events experience is the most intellectually challenging and educationally worthwhile endeavor it can be for all of those who take part in it.

**Inter-Judge Agreement:
An Analysis of the 1990 NFA and AFA-NIET
National Individual Events Tournaments**

Jon C. Bruschke
University of Utah

K. Jeanine Congalton
California State University, Fullerton

Robert H. Gass
California State University, Fullerton

The growth of individual events has generated new avenues for forensics research. Forensics educators, concerned with developing equitable standards of evaluation, have focused much of their discussion on the judging of individual events. This focus has provided the groundwork for a variety of studies concerning the critic's role in the evaluation process. For example, examinations have been directed towards the need for utilization of judge training workshops (Swarts and Wilson, 1989; Olson, 1989). Dean and Benoit (1984), Carey and Rodier (1987), Pratt (1987) and Olson and Wells (1988) provide information focused on judges' justifications for decisions. And discussions such as those exemplified by Bradford (1988) and Schulist (1988) describe the qualities of critics. The nature of these and other discussions direct attention to a movement intent on improving the quality of judging in individual events.

The proliferation of essays focusing on judging individual events should come as no surprise to the individual events community. During the academic year, students, coaches and critics frequently agonize over decisions. But, ultimately, it is the judge who bears responsibility for the evaluation process. Despite our reactions to judges and their evaluations, the very nature of the activity implies that some measure of credibility is assigned to the act of ranking and rating student performances. Although provisions (e.g. event descriptions, instructions to judges) lend guidance to the evaluation process, research on whether critics reach significant levels of agreement when evaluating the "same speech" is limited. Our concern, then, is with whether critics in multiple judge panels exhibit significant degrees of inter-judge agreement. Understanding the level of inter-judge agreement will, in turn, advance our knowledge of the role the speech act itself plays in the evaluation process.

Employing a content analysis of selected ballots, Allen and Dennis (1989) present some evidence to warrant concerns regarding divergent impressions of judges observing the same speech. Lewis and Larsen (1981) analyzed the effects of judge training on prior and subsequent judge agreement in the evaluation of poetry readings. They claimed that, following a training session, experienced judges showed significantly greater agreement. The limitation to critics evaluating poetry, however, does not provide an explanation of whether similar claims can be advanced for other individual events.

Kay and Aden's (1984) comprehensive study of judging patterns at the 1984 National Forensics Association Nationals revealed only 65.22% agreement (for rankings) among judging panels. Given this lack of judge agreement, Kay and Aden argued that perhaps a student's success at tournaments was "more of a function of chance than skill" (p. 89).

An initial study by Gass, Brusckke and Congalton (1990) revealed that inter-judge agreement at the 1988 AFA-NIET was disturbingly low. The analysis of preliminary rounds at this tournament indicated that limited preparation events reflected the greatest amount of inter-judge agreement, followed by public address events. Interpretation events exhibited the least amount of inter-judge agreement. It should be noted, however, that even though inter-judge agreement for interpretation events as a category in and of itself was low, Poetry exhibited the greatest degree of inter-judge agreement. Generally, however, inter-judge agreement at the 1988 AFA-NIET was low.

Given the increasing concern about the judge's role in individual events tournaments, and given the paucity of literature specifically pertaining to inter-judge agreement, we sought to analyze the degree of inter-judge agreement at two national level tournaments which employ multiple judge panels in preliminary rounds. The results of the 1990 National Forensics Association Tournament and the 1990 American Forensic Association - National Individual Events Tournament serve as a basis for the analysis.

METHODS AND RESULTS

The data consisted of tabulation sheets of the preliminary rounds from the 1990 National Forensic Association Tournament and the 1990 American Forensic Association - National Individual Events Tournament. At both tournaments, each speaker was judged by two critics per preliminary round; each round was considered as one case for analysis. The unit of analysis was the degree of agreement between two judges hearing the same speaker in any given round.

For cases analyzed, each judge theoretically observed the same speech. Thus, we would argue that the level of inter-judge agreement represents the extent to which judges' rankings can be attributed to student performance. The remaining

variance represents the extent to which judges are affected by something not common to both judges. In essence, the variance not accounted for can be attributed to the judges themselves.

Pearson's product-moment correlation coefficient can measure the degree of correlation between different scores of ranked data (Runyon & Haber, 1976). In this study, correlation coefficients were employed to determine the amount of agreement among judges. The analysis of data here is descriptive for each event of each tournament (see Tables 1 and 2). Given the nuances of differences in both event descriptions and qualifying procedures for the NFA and AFA-NIET, correlations for each tournament are reported separately.

Analysis of the specific individual events for both national tournaments indicates that all correlations for events were significant at the .001 level. Generally, then, judges at the 1990 NFA and the 1990 AFA-NIET exhibited a statistically significant degree of inter-judge agreement for all events. It is of interest to note, however, that despite these findings the absolute best inter-judge agreement that critics achieve is still less than thirty percent.

At the NFA Tournament, After Dinner Speaking exhibited the greatest degree of inter-judge reliability (27%), with Extemporaneous and Prose, each reflecting 22% inter-judge agreement. Additionally, we would note that Poetry achieved only a 15% rating of inter-judge agreement while inter-judge agreement for Rhetorical Criticism was the lowest at 13%.

The AFA-NIET results demonstrate the greatest level of inter-judge agreement (22%) for Dramatic Duo and a 16% degree of agreement for Extemporaneous Speaking. For the AFA-NIET tournament, the experimental even, Program Oral Interpretation, demonstrated the least amount of inter-judge agreement (7%). Of the traditional events, Impromptu, Informative and Communication Analysis yielded the lowest degree of inter-judge agreement (8%).

The results of inter-judge agreement for both poetry and persuasion at the 1990 AFA-NIET indicate that we should not assume specific events exhibit trends in inter-judge agreement. Gass, Bruschte and Congalton's (1990) study of the 1988 AFA-NIET demonstrated that the greatest inter-judge agreement was found in Poetry; inter-judge agreement for Persuasion was virtually nonexistent. Yet, in 1990 (see Table 2), the degree of inter-judge agreement for Poetry is relatively low (9%), and at the 1990 AFA-NIET, the degree of inter-judge reliability for persuasion had increased to 12%. The reversal in degree of agreement for each of these events would suggest that the results of inter-judge agreement for the 1988 and 1990 AFA-NIET's cannot be generalized to this organization's subsequent national tournaments.

The individual events community should also note that neither Rhetorical Criticism (NFA), nor its AFA-NIET counterpart, Communication Analysis, exhibit an overwhelming degree of inter-judge agreement. The fact that these specific events produce the least amount of agreement is probably of little surprise to the forensics community. Several essays provide instruction which both demystify and provide direction for students and forensics educators (Mills, 1983; German, 1985; Shields and Preston, 1985; Dean, 1985; Rosenthal, 1985; Larson, 1985; Benoit and Dean, 1985). Most recently Murphy (1988) and Aden and Kay (1989) have engaged in a dialogue centered on determining the locus of analysis for these events. Although these discussions provide insight into the events, they also reflect the inability of the forensics community to agree on what the focus of these events should be.

Finally, we would note that the correlations for inter-judge agreement at the National Forensic Association tournament appear stronger than those found at the American Forensic Association -- National Individual Events Tournament. Two explanations for this conclusion are possible. First, the number of cases per event

analyzed for the NFA is in many instances three times that of the "n" for the corresponding event of the AFA-NIET. Theoretically, this greater number of cases provides for increased inter-judge agreement. Second, we would note that differences in qualification procedures among the two national tournaments might also affect the degree of inter-judge agreement at the two tournaments.

CONCLUSIONS

The results of this study indicate that critics at both the NFA and AFA-NIET exhibited statistically significant degrees of inter-judge agreement. Yet the best rate of inter-judge agreement (less than 30%) was found in only one event at one of the two national tournaments. As a result, we would note that for every event the vast degree of evaluation can be attributed more to a judge's perceptual process than to the speech act.

Additional research could determine whether these results apply only to the 1990 national tournaments or whether specific events (or categories of events) frequently exhibit greater degrees of inter-judge agreement than others. Consideration could then be given to evaluating potential trends in inter-judge agreement. Another avenue of research could focus on the evaluation of inter-judge agreement at invitational tournaments. Thus, determinations might be made as to whether the degree of inter-judge agreement found at national tournaments corresponds with the levels of inter-judge agreement found at invitational tournaments.

Granted, all forms of judging are inherently subjective. Whether the interpretation and subsequent evaluation occur in the legal arena or in a sports arena (or, for that matter, in any situation in which judgments are made), theoretically, people simply do not "see" the same event. Perhaps within the field of speech communication, we are mistakenly led to believe that, given parameters for

a public performance and given experienced critics, inter-judge agreement should be expected. However, this study, and the results of other analyses of judge agreement, indicate that such expectations are unwarranted.

Forensics competitors might rest comfortably knowing that the level of agreement among judges at the NFA and AFA-NIET is significant. Yet, acknowledging that the level of inter-judge agreement is, at best, 28% (for only one event) suggests that action needs to be taken to ensure that the speech itself plays a greater role in the judging process. Whether that action comes in the form of developing judging workshops needs to be determined. Regardless, the forensics community should continue to strive to ensure that judges focus on both the quality of and communication of the speech as the primary means of evaluation.

Table 1
1990 National Forensic Association
National Individual Events Tournament

Correlation coefficients and r^2

<i>Event</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>r²</i>	<i>n</i>
Duo	.45	.20	591
Extemporaneous	.47	.22	614
After Dinner	.53	.28	566
Informative	.45	.20	713
Rhetorical Criticism	.37	.13	462
Prose	.47	.22	1182
Persuasion	.44	.19	685
Poetry	.39	.15	671

All correlations are significant at the .001 level.

Table 2
 1990 American Forensic Association
 National Individual Events Tournament

Correlation coefficients and r^2

Event	r	r ²	n
Duo	.47	.22	150
Extemporaneous	.40	.16	159
After Dinner	.33	.11	147
Informative	.28	.08	159
Communication Analysis	.28	.08	151
Prose	.36	.13	149
Persuasion	.34	.12	255
Poetry	.30	.09	153
Impromptu	.29	.08	168
Drama	.35	.13	261
Program Oral Interp.	.26	.07	225

All correlations are significant at the .001 level.

REFERENCES

Aden, R. & Kay, J. (1989). *Clarifying tournament rhetorical criticism: A proposal for new rules and standards*. *National Forensic Journal*, 7, 29-31.

Allen, G. & Dennis, G. (1989). *Everything is what it is and not another thing: A hierarchical criteria for evaluation in informative, persuasion, and communication analysis*. In L. Schnoor and V. Karns (Eds.), *Perspectives on Individual Events: Proceedings of the First Developmental Conference on Individual Events* (pp. 53-59). Mankato, MN: Speech Department, Mankato State University.

Benoit, W.L. & Dean, K.W. (1985). *Rhetorical criticism of literary artifacts*. *National Forensic Journal*, 3, 154-162.

Bradford, V. (1988, February). *The role of the critic: A position paper*. Paper presented at the Western Speech Communication Association Convention, San Diego, CA.

Carey, J. & Rodier, R. (1987, November). *Judging the judges: A content analysis of interpretation ballots*. Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association Convention, Boston, MA.

Dean, K.W. (1985). *Coaching contest rhetorical criticism*. *National Forensic Journal*, 3, 116-127.

Dean, K.W. & Benoit, W.L. (1984). *A categorical analysis of rhetorical criticism ballots*. *National Forensic Journal*, 2, 99-108.

Gass, R.H., Brusckhe, J.C., & Congalton, K.J. (1990). *Inter-judge agreement: An empirical analysis of the 1988 American Forensic Association -- National Individual Events Tournament*. Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association Convention, Chicago, IL.

German, K.M. (1985). *Finding a methodology for rhetorical criticism*. *National Forensic Journal*, 3, 86-101.

Kay, J. & Aden, R. (1984). *The relationship of judging panel composition to scoring at the 1984 N.F.A. Nationals*. *National Forensic Journal*, 2, 85-97.

Larson, S. (1985). *Communication analysis: A survey research report*. *National Forensic Journal*, 3, 140-153.

Lewis, J.L. & Larsen, J.K. (1981). *Inter-rater judge agreement in forensic competition*. *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, 28 (1), 85-97.

Mills, N.H. (1983). *Judging standards in forensics: Toward a uniform code in the 80's*. *National Forensic Journal*, 3, 19-31.

Murphy, J.M. (1988). *Theory and practice in communication analysis*. *National Forensic Journal*, 6, 1-12.

- Olson, C.D. & Wells, M. (1988, February). *Toward developing reasons for decisions: A content analysis of individual events ballots*. Paper presented at the Western Speech Communication Association, San Diego, CA.
- Olson, D.D. (1989). *Some answers to popular questions about the use of workshops for training individual events coaches and judges*. In L. Schnoor and V. Karns (Eds.), *Perspectives on Individual Events: Proceedings of the First Developmental Conference on Individual Events (15-18)*. Mankato, MN: Speech Department, Mankato State University.
- Pratt, J.W. (1987, November). *Judging the judges: A content analysis of ballots for original public speaking events*. Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association Convention, Boston, MA.
- Rosenthal, R.E. (1985). *Changing perspectives on rhetorical criticism as a forensic event*. *National Forensic Journal*, 3, 128-138.
- Runyon, R.P. & Haber, A. (1976). *Fundamentals of Behavioral Statistics* (3rd ed.). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- Schulist, S. (1988, February). *Qualities of the good critic in an individual events round*. Paper presented at the Western Speech Communication Association, San Diego, CA.
- Shields, D.C. & Preston, C.T. (1985). *Fantasy theme analysis in competitive rhetorical criticism*. *National Forensic Journal*, 3, 102-115.
- Swarts, V. & Wilson, E. (1989) *Workshops: A direct and interactive forum for forensics coaches/judges*. In L. Schnoor and V. Karns (Eds.), *Perspectives on Individual Events: Proceedings of the First Developmental Conference on Individual Events (18-20)*. Mankato, MN: Speech Department, Mankato State University.

This theoretical article explores the implications of the informally trained coach/judge on the future of forensics. Issues addressed are those involving the relationship between informal training and the financial stability of the forensic program; the perceived professional standards associated with the forensic educator; and the impact on the educational facilitator role played by the coach/judge in the forensic community. The analysis of this paper suggests that the forensic community is placing the forensic professional and the activity itself at risk in the future, if informal training becomes the main means of preparing the next generation of coach/judge participants.

Telling the Story of the Informally Trained Coach/Judge

Colan T. Hanson, Ph.D.
North Dakota State University

The future of competitive forensics in the context of the modern university is a story whose ending is yet unwritten. This developmental conference, as well as others in the future, may help shape the writing of those uncharted conclusions. The issue of what are the implications of the informal training procedures for coaches/judges in individual events is an issue which will help tell the rest of the story. Charles Garfield wrote in *Peak Performers* (1986, p. 136) that:

The business world is full of goal-directed individuals who are not sure why they do what they do. I am thinking of people who focus on money as their primary goal, work very hard to get it, and have little ideas of a real mission - a larger context for that goal. . . . They are examples of a larger category of well-intentioned yet over-zealous people who incessantly try to prove themselves by launching powerfully toward a goal with no conscious mission behind it. Frequently they produce; often they achieve a modicum of success; but, charging from goal to goal with no mission to guide them, they live with the disquieting feeling that they are not really going in a direction they find personally fulfilling.

When one begins to anticipate what kind of conclusion will be written for the story of forensics in relation to the issue of living in a world of informal training, several concerns are identifiable. This theoretical paper will explore three possible

consequences of living in a world dominated by the informal training of coaches/judges in the forensic community. Specifically, the potential consequences of informal training on the variables of fiscal management of the forensic program, the status of the coach/judge as a professionally regarded individual, and the role of the coach/judge as facilitator of student growth and development will be explored.

Fiscal Management

The forensic program in the modern day university is often perceived as an expensive experiment. Budgets of \$20,000 to \$30,000 are frequently not uncommon travel budgets for competitive programs. If one added to those figures the salary dollars of the traveling coaches and judges, the budget figures become much larger. The question administrators seem to be asking with more frequency is what are we getting for our money? Is the forensic program a valuable asset to the institution? The old days of the forensic program being justified as an educational enrichment via travel for the student are rapidly becoming a thing of the past. If the forensic program is left in the hands of an individual not formally acquainted with the budgetary process in the university, the forensic program might soon die on the vine. Tucker (1961) indicated that a program administrator needs to understand more than just what is relevant to her/his unit:

The chairperson, then, should take a more global view of the budget process and learn as much as possible about financial conditions and priorities at all levels. . . . the chairperson should be aware of the system's technique for distributing funds among the institutions; he or she should be especially familiar with the procedures used to derive the resources that concern academic areas. . . . The [budget] process provides one of the few opportunities for the department to describe its past successes and future objectives (226-227).

As Tucker suggests, a program administrator must possess a sense of the whole in the budgeting process. Having a forensic director in the position of lacking a sophisticated understanding of the budgeting process is probably one quick means of letting a program die on the vine. The need for moving beyond informal training

for the coach/program director is further underscored when one realizes that most forensic budgets employ a "program" approach to the budgeting process. The need to be able to clearly articulate essential program components, under a program budget system, is critical for the coach:

A program is defined as a collection of related activities and services that together constitute the achievement of the goal. Theoretically, PPBS involves identifying objectives, listing alternative courses of action (showing cost benefit), choosing one alternative, and, finally, implementing the alternative through funding . . . reaching a consensus on what constitutes a program is difficult . . . Basically, PPBS incorporates the ideas of the zero-base system that an organization's goals and objectives should determine its budget; in addition, however, it includes a long-range planning component . . . The selection and number of component activities contained in a program depend on the scope of the stated goal and the preferences of the person who is developing the system (Tucker, pp. 231-233).

Providing for the long-term development of a forensic program in the future years of forensics will require a coach/director to need more than an informal training with the budgeting process used in the university. Indeed, it is likely that directors who change schools, or have new administrators take charge at their current institutions, are going to need to undertake some additional training in the new budgeting process. A casual visit with the Dean or Department Chair to request money for the forensic program will probably not be a part of the rest of the story in the next generation of forensic administrators. The coach/program director will not only need an understanding of the budgeting process within the university, but will need a clear sense of mission. The coach/program director will need to be in a position to articulate the mission and what elements will need to be a part of the program to achieve the mission. In all probability, the well-intentioned, informally trained program director will not survive in a future world of sophisticated forensic budgeting systems.

The forensic program of the future will not only need an individual schooled in resource management, but an individual also capable of developing an endowment fund for the program. The forensic program of tomorrow will, in all

probability, need to develop a means of self-generated funding. Outside funding will probably be needed to provide student scholarships and provide a substantial portion of the team's operating budget. However, as Edward J. Harris Jr. (1988, p. 81) has cautioned:

If individual events seeks to establish a university identity, then it should also seek direct financial support from a formal university source. Given the vagueness of student budgetary decisions and the concomitant loss of control of the program when students control the purse strings, it seems wise to seek a more neutral and consistent funding source.

If one places the longevity of the forensic program as a top priority, the responsibility for the management of the fiscal resources of the program ought not be left in the hands of an amateur who may be well-intentioned and informally trained but underprepared to deal with forensic finances of tomorrow. The assumption that any person can manage a forensic program is not a particularly realistic notion of the demands that will be placed on programs in the future.

Professional Status

Another issue which arises from the notion of the informally trained forensic coach/judge is the idea of the professional standing of the forensic person. As a profession, the forensic community will need to articulate its views on what standards should be reflected in the credentials of the forensic professional. The concept that a forensic professional can be an individual informally trained is, in reality, a dated notion. The Second National Conference on Forensics (1984, p. 28) articulated its position on the degree of professionalism expected of the forensic coach:

Forensic educators should be evaluated according to the same standards as other faculty -- teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service, to the degree to which each is appropriate to the mission of the individual college or university. They should satisfy each standard at the same level of quality expected of other faculty. Typically, forensic responsibilities do not fit neatly into any one of these traditional categories but cut across all three. Therefore, forensics educators may differ from other faculty in the amounts of teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service. Moreover, the criteria

for determining whether standards are met may distinguish forensic educators from other faculty.

The expectation that the forensic coach can be an informally trained individual simply does not meet the forensic community's own standard of professionalism.

Arguing from a similar position at the First Developmental Conference on Individual Events, Kostoff and McKeever (1988) maintained that training was an essential element for students making the transition from competitor to coach. Specifically, Kostoff and McKeever noted:

Coaching forensics is an experience that can be overwhelming at times even to those "seasoned" professionals. Day to day challenges encountered by the forensic educator can be both intellectually rewarding and problematic. In order to deal with such challenges, the forensics community needs leaders who are well-trained, educated, and dedicated to the field. Such leaders could only enhance the scholastic excellence and healthy competitiveness of the forensic activity (p. 102).

The forensic coach as a professional person is expected to manage a variety of functions. Without some professional training, the individual places her/himself and the forensic program at risk. The forensic coach of tomorrow will need professional training to meet the teaching, research, and scholarship demands placed on him/her by one's academic institution. Having an avid interest in forensics will not alone suffice for the forensic professional of tomorrow.

Educational Competency

A third major implication of the informal approach to training the forensic professional involves the competency of that person to fulfill the role of facilitator of the students' educational growth. If, by inference, we mean that the informally trained person is one whose background is principally built solely upon the individual's past involvement with tournament activities, then have we adequately discharged our educational responsibilities to our students? Don Swanson (1989) underscored the importance of professional training for the forensic coach/judge. Swanson argued:

Contemporary forensic practice is largely a result of modeling behavior. Students model the behavior of other competitors and of their judges. We serve as powerful models in many of our coaching techniques. . . . All of us who are members of the Order of Instruction and serve as judges in our national tournament, bear a responsibility by virtue of our designation as members of the Order of Instruction. I do not believe that as we enter a round we are just a "judge" placed in the competition to render a technical decision. We are forensic educators placed in a critic/judge position in order to foster the personal growth of the student competitors. If I am serious about my designation as a member of the Order of Instruction, the implications are: I cannot function as a tabula rasa judge. If I am to fulfill my moral responsibility as a member of the Order of Instruction, I must function as an interventionist educator. . . . If you remember the pledge you will not just play judge, you will instruct (p. 7).

As the Swanson position suggests, one cannot ethically fulfill one's responsibilities as a critic/judge if there is little more than a sense of conventional practice as opposed to theoretical insight behind the evaluation. The forensic professional needs to be well versed in the theory of communication before rendering evaluative judgments of the student's performance in the competitive tournament. Unless the forensic community is willing to embrace sophistry as its standard, the coach/judge needs more than an informal training as part of one's professional background.

If one is willing to embrace an educational perspective as being the principal focus of the forensic professional, then the need for the coach/judge to have more than an informal training becomes even more pronounced. Zarefsky articulated a perspective on what constitutes the nature of an educational mindset for the activity and for the forensic professional when he stated:

I'm not sure we have a clear notion of what an educational community is. To start with, education is not the consolation prize of unsuccessful programs; it's not true that some of us promote winning and others, education. Rather, I think that an educational community is premised on a belief about the goal of the enterprise. It is not just to implant a set of techniques or a body of content, but to enable students to learn how to think analytically and creatively and, hence, how to continue learning. In this respect forensics shares the virtues of the liberal arts. But to value education is to make some tradeoffs. An educational approach is inefficient; it is always far faster and easier to do something for another person than to wait patiently while the other develops the needed skill. An educational approach requires a long-run perspective, with thought to what will be best next month and next year, not just the next round. An educational approach requires self-restraint on the part of teachers and coaches, most of whom are so committed to what they do that it is difficult for them to see their art not performed well. An

educational approach requires coaches consciously to think of themselves as teachers, whether or not in the classroom, and whether by profession or avocation. And an educational approach leads inherently to the tension between providing structured environments – formats, rules, standards, guidelines, and the like – to maximize the chances of positive results, and providing freedom and guidance to students as they learn to make difficult choices for themselves. No one has a monopoly on educational insight, but a common commitment to the belief that this is an educational community shapes what issues we address and how we go about them (p. 22).

The role of critic/judge in the forensic community is a role that is best served by those having a professional background in the discipline of communication. The people who pass themselves off as forensic professionals but lack proper grounding in education and communication do the students and the forensic community a disservice.

The forensic educator is responsible for more than just the communication development of the student in the tournament setting. The coach/judge serves as a social, psychological and physical model for her/his students. President Reagan's debate coach, Roger Ailes, characterized his candidate by saying:

'You are the message.' What does that mean, exactly? It means that when you communicate with someone, it's not just the words you choose to send to the other person that make up the message. You're also sending signals about what kind of person you are – by your eyes, your facial expression, your body movement, your vocal pitch, tone, volume, and intensity, your commitment to your message, your sense of humor, and many other factors. The receiving person is bombarded with symbols and signals from you. Everything you do in relation to the other people causes them to make judgments about what you stand for and what your message is. 'You are the message' comes down to the fact that unless you identify yourself as a walking, talking message, you miss that critical point The total you affects how others feel about you and respond to you (p. 25).

Ailes' message for his candidate is an applicable message for those in the forensic community: one's behavior becomes a messenger for one's values. When the coach/judge is afforded a superior position in a superior/subordinate relationship with students, the behavior of the coach/judge also provides a frame of reference for behavior on the part of students. Consequently, if the background of the coach/judge is one in which there has been no professional development of the concept of modeling behavior, a serious concern regarding the dissemination of

inappropriate behaviors may emerge. In that context, students may come to confuse behaviors such as aggression with competitiveness, substance abuse with relaxation, exhaustion with marathonomism, and so forth.

Carl Rogers (1983) argued that the education of the student ought to be person-centered. In the context of competitive forensics and the over-riding issue of this paper, to engage in person-centered education with our students would require some professional background and training in the process of facilitating student learning. To hope that students would gain meaningful insights and have positive learning experiences by having the forensic contestants interact with adjudicators who were only informally trained seems a little like leaving too much to chance.

This writer believes that the major implication of having the training of the forensic professional be only informal in nature is one which invites disaster. Projecting the story of forensics in the world of tomorrow is obviously only a guess. Nevertheless, to assume that the forensic coach/judge will be able to functionally survive without formal training in finance; or assume that the research, teaching, and service expectations will not be a part of the accountability of the forensic coach; or also to assume that the coach can meet the personal growth needs of the students without an understanding of the educational process, would be to make a serious mistake about the future world of forensics. The forensic educator of tomorrow will require a background structured on something more than chance happenings. If the forensic community is left in the hands of those who are only informally trained, the activity which is at the heart of it all may readily die on the vine. Forensic programs of tomorrow will need program administrators [coach/judge] who are well-prepared and not just well-intentioned. The forensic educators will need a clear sense of mission and the tools that it takes to accomplish that mission.

REFERENCES

- Ailes, R. (1988). *You are the message*. New York: Doubleday.
- Dudczak, C.A. and Zarefsky, D. (1984). *Promotion and tenure standards*. In D. W. Parson (Ed.), *American forensics in perspective* (pp. 23-35). Annandale, VA: S.C.A.
- Garfield, C. (1986). *Peak performers*. New York: Avon Books.
- Harris, E.J. Jr. (1989). *Strategies to enhance university support for individual events programs*. In L. Schnoor and V. Karns (Eds.), *Perspective on individual events* (pp. 80-83). Mankato, MN: Mankato State University.
- Kostoff, R.A. and McKeever, S.M. (1989). *Training forensic graduate assistants: a development course*. In L. Schnoor and V. Karns (Eds.), *Perspective on individual events* (pp. 98-105). Mankato, MN: Mankato State University.
- Rogers, C. (1983). *Freedom to learn*. Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company.
- Swanson, D.R. (1989). *The future role of Pi Kappa Delta*. In R.S. Littlefield (Cmp.), *Proceedings of the developmental conference on the future role of Pi Kappa Delta in the forensic community* (pp. 1-10). Fargo, ND: North Dakota State University.
- Tucker, A. (1981). *Chairing the academic department*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.
- Zarefsky, D. (1990). *Remarks by David Zarefsky*. In J. Kay (Ed.), *Dialogue in the forensic community*. Kansas City, MO: National Federation of State High School Associations.

The attached position paper was presented at the 75th annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association. It was presented to surface issues relating to differences in perceptions regarding national forensics competition. The panel at which this paper was given attracted a very small number of audience members and reactors. Consequently, the ideas in the paper have not received much attention. For the purpose of the philosophical concerns topic area relating to organizational hierarchies of Individual Events associations, this paper is offered to examine issues relating to various organizational groups within the forensics community. Although it specifically addresses nationals competition, the substance of the paper definitely relates to differences between forensics organizations.

Community College Programs: How Have the AFA Nationals Affected This Population?

Mike Wartman
Normandale Community College

Because the content of this paper may inflame the proverbial ire of forensics coaches and zealots, I offer the following apologies, caveats and defensive rationalizations:

- Apology One:** For convenience sake, I have written the paper in direct reference to the AFA-NIET. This is not done to exclude the NFA as a national tournament, but to specifically address the problems that may be associated with both.
- Apology Two:** I think the AFA-NIET is a fantastic model for a national tournament. A tournament which provides competition for the top qualifiers is consistent with competition theory in determining national championships.
- Apology Three:** The ideas represented in this paper do not reflect an empirical or quantitative examination of community college perceptions of the AFA-NIET. Rather, the paper presents generalized perceptions of inevitable differences in forensics philosophy, tournament management practices and competition.
- Apology Four:** I represent a personal perspective that the value of a forensics program should not be determined by trophies, qualified students and national awards. The best interest of the supporting college and the forensics participants are best served by the non-competitive nature of competition.

Apology Five:

Many of the problems discussed in this paper may blame the AFA-NIET as the culprit, when in reality, the problems are those of the entire forensics community. Non-AFA schools may have their own rigorous procedures for qualification which result in the same problems as those generated by the AFA-NIET.

But enough apologies, what is the point? In viewing the AFA-NIET from afar, I am concerned with the attitudes, perceptions and procedures leading up to and qualifying for the AFA-NIET. I have no quarrel with the actual tournament. In fact, I have little knowledge of what even happens at the tournament, politically or competitively. However, the AFA-NIET is omnipresent throughout the forensics season due to the qualifying procedures it uses for the national competition.

In this position paper, I will discuss some of the problems that may be evident as a consequence of the AFA-NIET and qualifying procedures. Secondly, I will provide some idealistic suggestions designed to minimize the perceived difficulties. As stated in Apology Three, these difficulties may be the inevitable result of tournament overlap involving schools with different national tournament allegiances. However, the fact that these concerns have been expressed by various coaches and competitors may indicate some shared ideas regarding forensics problems.

CONCERN ONE

The AFA and AFA-NIET competition descriptions and rules have become the standardized rules for many tournaments. Tournaments that used to provide their own rules in tournament invitations (rules which may have been unique to that tournament) now conveniently refer to the AFA rules. In some forensics circles this move toward standardization has been applauded. Standardization of criteria should provide fairness and consistency in competition. But with the inclusion of AFA, NFA, Pi Kappa Delta and Phi Rho Pi schools at the same tournaments, the non-AFA schools may be forced to adapt to the AFA rules. Inconsistencies in duet interp, duet acting and dramatic duo rules and program oral interp involving 2 or 3 literary

genres are both examples in which a participant may need to adjust to the AFA rules because they have become the accepted rules for most tournaments. The participant may need to adjust, but why to the AFA rules in many situations? I'm simply uncomfortable with what I perceive to be a movement toward standardized AFA rules in many tournaments. I think this has limited the breadth and flexibility in individual events.

An unfortunate consequence of this movement has been the elimination of new, experimental or creative events at many tournaments. An attitude of "why bother, it doesn't qualify or get me a leg" appears prevalent in students and coaches. This attitude contradicts the educational and real life applications of forensics. An exception to the experimental event problem is, of course, the AFA Experimental Event. The branding of this event as the AFA experimental event had legitimized the event at many tournaments. Suddenly, program oral interp is popping up at tournaments which would not have dreamed of sponsoring the event prior to its inclusion as an AFA event. The Minnesota State Tournament and Organization has a constitutional provision stating that the AFA Experimental Event and the Experimental Event at the State Tournament cannot be the same event. I find this wisdom appropriate for AFA and non-AFA schools. (Even though I proposed it myself) I would argue, without evidence, that many forensics participants would not dream of entering an event not on the AFA's Magic 10 or Experimental Event entry if they are not qualified in their "primary or real" events. If a student cannot relax or experiment prior to the qualification for the AFA-NIET, the purpose of such rigor in qualification is suspect.

CONCERN TWO

The number of schools attending a tournament or the number of entries in an event have become a major source of coach and student concern. For a tournament

or event to produce qualifying entries and legs for the AFA-NIET, certain numbers must exist. A tournament or event's legitimacy should not be determined by how many legs they may produce. Yet, student and coach comments consistently reflect their awareness (and at times dissatisfaction) over numbers at a tournament. Granted, the AFA-NIET has set up guidelines for determining eligibility that should be accepted and honored. But, should a participant be minimizing competing in an event in which only one leg may result? When the end product of qualifying becomes the primary reason for student competition, the qualifying procedure should, again, be suspect.

CONCERN THREE

Contestant attitudes toward each other in competition may be affected by the qualifying procedures for the AFA-NIET. A competitor who wonders aloud or under his or her breath toward another competitor "aren't you already qualified in this event" has missed the value of forensics competition. Despite my coaching colleagues' reactions that their students would never utter such profanity, I have consistently overheard this direct comment, have had my own students report these comments to me, or have heard allusions to this attitude toward other competitors. Again, qualifying for the AFA-NIET may have primary importance for some programs and competitors, but the exclusion of previously-qualified contestants (or those unconcerned with qualifying) in thought or action is unconscionable. Even in the best interests of competition, competition from the best competitors should provide a challenge.

CONCERN FOUR

LEGS! LEGS! LEGS! If the AFA ever changes a logo, a representation of the three qualifying legs should dominate the design. The discussion of legs/qualifying tournaments is evident at all levels of competition.

- * "how many legs will this event provide at this tournament?"
- * "how many legs do you have in Prose?"
- * "how many legs does your extemporaneous need?"
- * award ceremonies often center on the joy that in poetry there will be three legs for the AFA-NIET
- * computer programs and results provide immediate leg information

Coaching in a program which has no "need" for legs, I am bombarded by team members questions on what legs are and how to get them. Seriously, the process contestants go through to qualify and receive their legs may cause countless other problems. In a position paper for the "Perspectives on Individual Events Conference," I argued for the problems associated with double entering. Among these were tournament logistical difficulties, decreased audience members for listening and intense competition for individual and team sweepstakes awards. These problems are also directly applicable for competitors intent on qualifying for the AFA-NIET. Contestants must simply enter as many events in as many tournaments to meet their schools' or the AFA-NIET's qualification criteria in those events. Intent on qualifying in as many events as possible, the contestants may simply be causing too many additional problems because of their entry.

CONCERN FIVE

The following concerns are entirely based on "rumors" of these activities happening at various tournaments. If they do exist, the seriousness of the problem warrants definite examination.

- * Last minute or pop up tournaments close to the end of the forensics season and prior to nationals. Tournaments being held solely to provide last chance opportunities to qualify for the AFA-NIET minimize the entire qualification procedure.
- * Run down tournaments in which tournaments are held and completed until qualification is completed. I hope this is only a rumor.

- * Tournament managers bending entry guidelines to add more non-sweep entries but possible AFA-NIET qualifiers as individuals. If maximum entry guidelines exist, they should be adhered to.

Overall, these concerns are not the direct result of the AFA-NIET. These problems persist in the attitudes of forensics participants and coaches. If the vehicle of the AFA-NIET and its qualification procedures are responsible for these concerns, then the vehicle and qualification should be examined. The following ideas and suggestions are offered to provide general insight on attitudes and changes. In providing suggestions to what I feel are some of the difficulties related to the AFA-NIET, it must be stated that there are always going to be problems associated with any type of competition. Participants and coaches pressured by themselves or the schools they represent may need to be less ideal in their attitudes toward competition. I do, however, feel that suggestions need to be discussed to resolve some of the perceived problems.

SUGGESTION ONE

In arguing the merits and budget for forensics as an activity, factors other than numbers of qualified students, award winners and national championships should be emphasized. A program which has to qualify students to survive as a program will invariably be more driven by competition than a program that has other criteria for evaluation. Arguments regarding the additional benefits of the forensics program may serve to sell the program in areas other than competition and therefore eliminate the pressure toward results.

SUGGESTION TWO

The AFA-NIET should simply NOT be emphasized as the "end all" to the forensics season. Because the AFA-NIET does "crown" individual winners and team awards it is inevitable to look at the tournament as the event to finish the season. Bottom line, however, is that all contestants cannot win first place or even make it to

an out round at the AFA-NIET. What should be emphasized throughout the year and at the AFA-NIET are the billions of benefits that may come out of the forensics activity and season regardless of the AFA-NIET even existing.

SUGGESTION THREE

Participants and coaches should be frank in accepting the fact that all competitors will NOT qualify for the AFA-NIET. If memory serves correctly, the AFA-NIET was developed for this reason alone! For a coach to continually look for endless ways to qualify a contestant who has not qualified through the forensics season and the district tournament sheds some insight on the ethical practices of that coach. A coach should not minimize a participants chances to quality, but a degree of reality must be communicated by the coach.

SUGGESTION FOUR

The semantic emphasis on qualification and legs should be lessened in all areas concerned with qualification. The qualification procedures and results should be handled by the individual school and the district committees designed to process this information. Award ceremonies and publicized emphasis on AFA-NIET related concerns do not need to be such an obvious part of tournaments in which non-AFA schools are part of the tournament. This may seem like a petty suggestion, but it could lessen the overuse of the qualification procedures and language.

SUGGESTION FIVE

Bickering on the relative status, of national forensics organizations and their national tournament needs to stop. Conversation and bragging rights regarding which tournament produces the true national champion or team is ludicrous. The Phi Rho Pi National Tournament, for example, is no less of a tournament because no individual is awarded the top honor in an event. There is nothing wrong with a

national organization having a different philosophy and format to qualify or run a tournament.

SUGGESTION SIX

The AFA should investigate tournaments which may be hastily scheduled and administered. If last minute tournaments are being hosted simply to act as a last chance opportunity to qualify contestants then the entire qualification procedure is undermined and in need of examination.

The perceived problems with the AFA-NIET are probably minor when compared to the unique experience the tournament provides for participants and schools. With this experience however are some unique problems which may be consequence of the AFA-NIET. Hopefully, participant attitudes regarding competition and the qualification procedure may receive attention by the AFA, coaches and participants in the tournament. Ideally, the AFA-NIET experience should be judged by the experience generated by the tournament and not entirely by the competitive experience alone.

**National Individual Events Tournament
Qualifying Legs:
An Idea Whose Time Has Passed**

Clark D. Olson
Director of Forensics
Arizona State University

The national individual events tournament hierarchy has a significant impact on practices at invitational tournaments. Regardless of which national affiliation one holds, participants are constantly being bombarded with questions of "7/12?" or "How many legs?" It is the contention of this essay to examine the role that the national hierarchy has had with regard to the at-large qualification method, examine an alternative, and provide implications for an alternative qualifying method.

History

The American Forensic Association-National Individual Events Tournament (AFA-NIET) came into existence when individual events were already quite well established. Figure 1 shows that the total number of individual events tournaments was fairly constant both prior to the creation of the tournament (236) and ten years into its existence (229). Hence, the tournament itself has not provided an impetus for a significant addition in the number of tournament opportunities. However, the existence of the AFA-NIET has caused the events offered at most tournaments to become much more uniform in line with the events

offered at the national tournament. Figure 1 shows the consistency with which all 10 regularly sanctioned AFA-NIET events are currently offered as compared to much greater irregularity prior to its existence. Indeed the fluctuation between the experimental events of Sales Speaking and Programmed Oral Interpretation indicate great variance in their offerings at invitational tournaments pending their existence at the AFA-NIET. Earlier event trends mirror the addition of events at the National Forensic Association Tournament initiated in 1970.

The current at-large qualification method was created primarily for two reasons. Initially, the AFA-NIET wanted a smaller, more exclusive tournament than the previously established National Forensic Association's Individual Events National Tournament, so the at-large/district qualification procedure was enacted. Secondly, since the sponsoring body, the American Forensic Association, also sponsored the National Debate Tournament, complete with an at-large/district qualification system already in place, it seemed logical to parallel that structure with one similar for individual events.

Throughout the thirteen year history of the tournament, the at-large system has been modified a number of times, placing limits on the total number of placings, and establishing a scale for the number of participants which constitutes a qualifying "leg." However, with these slight modifications, the qualifying systems remains largely the same as the one originated by the founders in 1978.

Disadvantages of Legs

Qualifying legs have outlived their usefulness for three primary reasons: they are continually circumvented, they cheapen the value of achievements at individual tournaments, and they are cumbersome to administer.

Initially, there are continual efforts made to circumvent the current leg policy. While in theory it should be quite easy to determine what does and does not

constitute a qualifying leg, there have been numerous attempts made to proliferate qualifying legs in an effort to secure more slots to the AFA-NIET. Specific policies have even been enacted to thwart such practices as unadvertised "last chance" tournaments where tournaments were thrown together following a district qualifier to "help" "deserving" competitors qualify for nationals, sometimes allowing student judges, and sometimes even announcing which students needed legs. Perhaps one of the most flagrant violations occurred when a lone contestant from a local beauty school was entered to round out the number of schools at 10, making the tournament a qualifying event. However that is only one attempt to circumvent the legs policy. Recent national committee decisions have surrounded problems with "hidden legs" and a single school hosting two tournaments on the same weekend. Just when one circumvention technique is disallowed, a creative forensicator will dream up another to stir up controversy over the integrity of the AFA-NIET qualifying system.

Secondly, the at-large leg system cheapens student achievements at individual tournaments. Since nearly all tournaments have qualifying legs, every competitive opportunity a student has is toward gaining legs to qualify for the national tournament. Each tournament, then, becomes a means to an end and is not appreciated for the intrinsic value for which it holds apart from the national tournament. No doubt every coach has had to console a student who placed fourth at an important tournament only to be disgusted that fourth was not a leg and one place higher would have earned the student a leg. Since not all students who participate in individual events will qualify or even hope to qualify for the AFA-NIET, it seems to devalue a fine performance at any tournament when a leg is not received. Certainly individual tournaments have far more value, both educationally and competitively than as merely a method for qualifying for a single national tournament.

Several practices at invitational tournaments point to the fact that success at individual tournaments is cheapened in the quest for at-large legs. When students who have already earned three qualifying legs are in a final round with students who have yet to qualify, it has been known that those students who have already qualified have performed less than their best to purposely allow unqualified students to earn legs. Clearly, there is little educational or competitive value to such a practice. Similarly, coaches may be coerced into entering unprepared students in an event just to fill out a leg requirement, and unprepared students may be coerced into performing to just obtain a score so the requisite number of contestants appear on a tabulation sheet. The reverse may also be true. Students who have already earned their three legs may be discouraged from further competitive opportunities to allow more students to earn legs, thus disallowing further educational benefit from participating in that event. In fact, students who do not voluntarily remove themselves from competition may be ridiculed by those who have yet to qualify. Qualifying for the AFA-NIET may not be a director's sole reason for entering a student in an invitational tournament. Furthermore, some tournament directors may collapse varsity and novice contestants into a single division, not for educational reasons, but to generate for legs for the AFA-NIET. Clearly, all such practices have questionable educational implications and are certainly suspect of competitive value.

Consistent with this problem is the over-emphasis that students may place exclusively on the AFA-NIET. If participation in that tournament becomes a student's sole goal, a less than successful performance at that single tournament or failure to qualify for the AFA-NIET can cause a student to believe he/she had an unsuccessful season, when his/her fine record at a number of invitational tournaments throughout the year may belie that claim. Competitive success should

not be determined by a single performance, and the preoccupation with qualifying for the AFA-NIET can breed that attitude.

The final, and undoubtedly most time consuming problem with the at-large qualifying system, is that it is cumbersome. Countless hours are spent by district chairs calculating the legs.

For the 1990 AFA-NIET 645 of the 987 entries were earned at-large. Given the existence of 246 individual events tournaments, keeping accurate records and verifying these 645 events, to say nothing of all the other earned legs which are never used for qualifying is an arduous burden, one often fraught with error. For the national tournament director, merely determining which students have qualified for the tournament is often a three week verification task. If all the time record keeping for the AFA-NIET was instead channelled into educational pursuits aimed at improving the pedagogical aspects of the activity, no doubt nearly all involved in the activity would conclude that the amount of time spent record keeping was extreme and could be more productively spent. Instead, what currently exists is a body of creative and talented educators spending their time doing basic clerical tasks, hardly duties befitting their training.

Not only are qualifying legs cumbersome for individual directors who must submit them and district chairs who must verify them, the whole notion of legs is one which plagues the NIET committee. Great quantities of valuable meeting time have been spent discussing the issues surrounding legs. In just the past two years, the committee has addressed the number of contestants which should count toward a qualifying leg, whether or not all divisions at a tournament should be legs, and removing the maximum number of 9 for NIET qualification. These philosophical concerns in addition to thwarting the circumvention techniques listed above to maintain the integrity of the tournament comprise a great amount of the NIET committee's meeting time. Again, there seem to be better ways to spend national

committee time. While one purpose of the committee is to oversee the national tournament, certainly a secondary objective is to promote the educational nature of the forensic activity. And when the bulk of time is spent quibbling over who has/has not, should/should not qualify for the national tournament, it again seems like a waste of valuable resources. When leaders congregate to share ideas, they should do more than referee qualification disputes.

No doubt there exist several other reasons why qualifying legs do not meet their intended purpose. From an historical perspective, the at-large system has been argued to be a major reason for the decline in NDT debate: it has fostered an elitist system, where a dedicated few must adopt travel patterns which may not be educationally sound, but which are necessary to fulfill NDT at-large qualification requirements. While individual events appears in no immediate danger of a significant decline in participation, a certain trend of elitism is emerging. One need not comment on the fact that but a single school has been the national champion for eleven consecutive years, and those schools in the top ten remain relatively constant as well. Perhaps the at-large qualification system should be examined to see if it, too, fosters a sense of elitism and if participation from some less successful schools is discouraged by the current at-large qualification method.

An Alternative to the At-Large Qualification Method

While several potential modifications of the AFA-NIET qualification procedure no doubt exist, I wish to present one which has been prominently discussed in several districts, but never actively proposed. The solution proposed here is to eliminate the at-large qualification procedure and move exclusively to district qualification. However, the procedure would be modified to include two district tournaments, one during the fall semester and one during the spring semester. The specifics of amending the AFA-NIET Charter By-Laws would be:

1. Eliminate By-law V (At-Large Qualification Process)
2. Amend By-law VI (District Qualifiers)
 - B. Change top 10% to top 15%, i.e:

21-26 competitors	4 slots
27-33 competitors	5 slots
34-40 competitors	6 slots
41-46 competitors	7 slots
47-53 competitors	8 slots
54-60 competitors	9 slots
61-67 competitors	10 slots
68-73 competitors	11 slots
74-80 competitors	12 slots.
 - E. Replace with "Fall District Qualifying tournaments shall be held between October 15 and December 15. Spring District Qualifying tournament shall be held after January 15 and no later than the third week-end in March.
 - F. Change each school may enter a maximum of five students in each of the events to maximum of ten students in each of the events.
 - G. Intentions. Add "Alternates from the Fall District Qualifying Tournament shall compete in the Spring District Qualifying Tournament unless they have already been advanced due to the nonparticipation of a Fall District Qualifier. If a Fall alternate should qualify at the Spring District Qualifier and be subsequently advanced from the Fall Tournament, the next alternate from the Spring District Qualifier shall be advanced.

These changes would also need to be reflected in each of the district constitutions and by-laws as well once adopted by the NIET committee.

Implications

Perhaps the first concern is what impact the elimination of the at-large system will have on the size of the AFA-NIET. By using the best available data from the AFA-NIET tournament director, given the approximate number of district qualifiers from each district, Figure 2 displays the actual number of tournament qualifiers 1988-1990 and then taking the top 15% instead of top 10% and doubling the figure who qualified from the district tournaments (to represent two district tournaments), the second figure for each year was arrived at, which approximates the number of qualifiers that would occur under the double district method. The larger the event, the smaller the discrepancy between the two systems. The largest discrepancies occur in the smallest events, After Dinner Speaking and Communication Analysis. To preserve the integrity of the extrapolation method, these data were left unaltered. However, given the relatively small size of entries at district tournaments in these events, it can be argued that the number of qualifiers under the double district method would not be significantly larger than the current number of qualifiers. Despite those artificial increases, the total number of qualifiers at the AFA-NIET under the double district method varies between 5-10% more than currently entered. Given the size constraints on the smaller events, most likely the size increase would be negligible.

While this system no doubt will need refinement and will probably be subject to some potential circumvention, the circumvention done at a few regulated tournaments is much easier to control than that done at invitational tournaments. The entire qualification procedure will then be under the purview of the district chairs and hence the AFA-NIET committee. Questionable tournament practices

can be regulated by the districts and procedures deemed "un-educational" can be eliminated.

Since the tournament exists not for the coaches, but for the students, it is important to determine what impact this alternative method may have on students. Given the addition of a fall district qualifier, this method will reward students who prepare their events and are successful early, similar to the goal of the current at-large system. In addition, it marks a clear time period for mid-year graduates to qualify at the national tournament.

Perhaps the biggest implication would be on individual invitational tournaments. One could argue that participation in individual tournaments would decline since there is no incentive to qualify for the national tournament. But the data in figure 1 seem to deny that, in that there has been no proliferation of tournaments since the advent of the AFA-NIET, in fact there has been a slight decrease in overall number of tournaments offering individual events. Invitational tournaments were strong prior to the AFA-NIET, there is no reason to believe that a lack of leg incentive will cause tournaments to dramatically decrease.

In fact, it could be argued that forensic participation may actually increase. For programs with small budgets, attending only the two district tournaments is essential for participation in the national tournament. Smaller programs do not need to attend a series of small, perhaps weak, tournaments in the quest for legs, but instead with the increased percentage of qualification slots at districts have an equal chance to qualify for the AFA-NIET. Travel patterns will perhaps not be predicated on who can get a leg where, but on who can get the best educational opportunity at which tournament. Decisions made based on education instead of national qualification can only improve the nature of the activity.

In addition, the elimination of legs restores the achievements of individuals at invitational tournaments. Instead of looking at the results of a tournament as a

means for national qualification, a student can take pride in performing well and being successful at each individual competition, instead of using it as a means to an end.

While some may argue that the double district method may place undue pressure on students to perform at a single tournament, it does allow students at least two chances to qualify in their events. Given the subjective nature of forensic activity, there are always some deserving students who do not qualify for the AFA-NIET, and that would no doubt continue. But with two opportunities to qualify and a larger number of qualifying slots, all deserving students should have a fair chance to qualify for the AFA-NIET.

Finally, the double district method vastly reduces the amount of paperwork necessary to determine qualifiers and will reduce the time commitment for those involved in administration. Instead of needing to examine the results from 245 tournaments, the tournament director needs the results from only 18 tournaments, a much more manageable number. While there could be some confusion in advancing alternates from one tournament to the other, certainly no more time should be spent on this task than is already spent notifying alternates of their pending participation. While the addition of a second district tournament does require the district chair to direct another tournament, most district chairs regularly direct several tournaments per year so that this is a familiar task. And given the increased educational benefit of a tournament over a volume of paperwork, the educational trade off seems worthwhile. For large geographic districts, a tournament could be held at both sides of the district, allowing all schools the chance to participate at least once at minimal expense. Or, a central location could be settled upon so cost approximations can be regularized.

In addition to lowering the amount of paperwork for the district chairs, it also frees up more meeting time for the AFA-NIET committee to explore methods of improving the forensic activity instead of worrying about qualification methods.

While the double district method may seem like a radical alternative to the current at-large qualification method, it does seem like a solution to many of the problems which plague the current system. While it is no panacea for all the problems faced by the AFA-NIET, it is a solution worthy of consideration. Only when it is experimented with, will the full implications of its adoption be known. But the substantial benefits it offers with minimal costs, both to participants and for the AFA-NIET organization as a whole, make it worth the risk.

Figure 1

EVENTS AT INDIVIDUAL EVENTS TOURNAMENTS

	73/ 74	74/ 75	75/ 76	76/ 77	77/ 78	78/ 79	86/ 87	87/ 88	88/ 89	89/ 90
INTERP	236	267	333	389	426	448				
Prose							199	213	206	231
Poetry							197	213	200	225
Drama							144	171	170	194
ORAT	171	173	205	204	225	220	210	226	213	234
IMP	87	99	118	122	140	145	204	214	210	227
EXT	137	138	169	171	195	189	195	211	200	221
ADS	71	83	100	118	146	148	200	217	204	225
INF	66	78	119	130	170	176	205	224	213	231
CA/RC	38	52	70	85	101	101	163	184	180	195
DUO	30	44	76	74	151	151	196	204	194	229
SALES	7	7	14	17	18	11	81	114	14	13
POI	106	107	115	100	84	74	21	33	118	160
TOTAL # OF IND. EVENTS TOURNAMENTS			236				215	229	219	
	245									

Data compiled from Intercollegiate Speech Tournament Results, from the designated years, edited by Jack H. Howe, Edward J. Harris, and Seth C. Hawkins.

Figure 2

**AFA-NIET QUALIFIERS
AT-LARGE VS. DOUBLE DISTRICT METHOD**

EVENT	1988		1989		1990	
	AL	00	AL	00	AL	00
IMPROMPTU	106	110	108	110	111	114
INFORMATIVE	91	94	94	94	88	90
PROSE	117	118	115	110	122	122
DUO	82	94	71	78	82	81
EXTEMP	77	78	84	82	85	90
PERSUASIVE	88	90	85	90	87	84
DRAMA	93	94	86	90	88	94
POETRY	103	118	95	110	113	100
ADS	67	78	62	78	74	90
CA	57	82	52	82	60	81
TOTALS	853	956	834	924	899	946

Data determined from information from Guy Yates, AFA-NIET Tournament Director presented to AFA-NIET Committee.

APPENDIX

THE ETHICAL USE OF EVIDENCE IN PUBLIC ADDRESS EVENTS

by

**Sheryl A. Friedley
George Mason University**

**Developmental Conference on Individual Events
Denver, Colorado
August 17-19, 1990**

The Ethical Use of Evidence in Public Address Events

Introduction*

As we enter the decade of the '90s and round the corner heading toward the 21st century, Americans appear to be more concerned than ever about the issue of "ethics." This continued interest in studying moral behavior has led to the development of more explicit codes of conduct in business, professional, and educational settings. In keeping with this interest, the forensic community has also spent the last two decades exploring the ethical nature of forensics; specifically, the forensic community has continued to consider the ethical standards that should be established for use of evidence in public address events.

For purposes of this discussion, evidence will be defined simply as

data, consisting of statements of fact or opinion, which may be transformed into proof through the use of reasoning...and is usually attributed to a source other than the speaker (Thomas, 1983, pp. 1-2).

Evidence of this nature is typically used in the following public address events found in national competition: persuasive speaking, informative speaking, after dinner

*A portion of the initial rationale developed in this paper was presented by the author in an earlier publication; this publication is cited as a "Reference."

-2-

speaking, rhetorical criticism/communication analysis, extemporaneous speaking, and impromptu speaking. These public address events usually require the speaker to posit claims which may be supported by evidence attributed to sources other than the speaker.

The Need for Ethical Guidelines

The classic textbooks which focus on the coaching of individual events most often address the use of evidence in the public address events from a "qualitative" perspective rather than an "ethical" perspective. The discussion of evidence usage for specific individual events typically includes a description of the types of supporting evidence available as well as traditional tests of evidence credibility. In contrast, the discussion of the ethical use of evidence in the public address events is limited almost exclusively to a discussion of plagiarism. For example, Faules et al. (1976) "suggest" that the individual events of extemporaneous speaking and persuasive speaking be evaluated in part by "sure use of supporting material" and note that writing the original speech should be the primary responsibility of the student rather than the coach; however, the authors provide no clearly-defined guidelines for the ethical use of supporting material in the public address events. Klopf and Lahman (1976) provide a bit more specificity concerning the ethical use of evidence when they note that "not more than 150 words of quoted material should

-3-

be used and that direct quotes are set off by quotation marks; plagiarism is forbidden" (pp. 206-207). In both of these noted texts on coaching forensics there is no amplification of the term "plagiarism" or the many variations of willful distortion that may be considered unethical for individual events competition. Furthermore, the bulk of evidence usage discussion in these texts focuses on such concerns primarily in debate competition rather than individual events competition.

While such textbooks on coaching forensics provide little focus on the ethical use of evidence in public address events, the forensic community as a whole has clearly demonstrated a concern for the issue of ethics. The 1974 National Developmental Conference on Forensics at Sedalia brought forensic scholars together for the purpose of identifying common concerns and establishing common goals for the forensic activity. Among several issues addressed, the conferees offered a resolution which introduced the ethical goal of forensics and role of coaches in furthering this goal. The resolution posited the following philosophy:

Forensics should promote adherence to the ethical and scholarly obligation of the advocate, including respect for the integrity of evidence, accurate representation of the ideas of others, and rigorous examination of beliefs (McBath, 1976, p. 16).

This resolution specifically encouraged forensic scholars to pursue an understanding of evidence used to make claims in contest speaking (debate and individual events) and urged

forensic contestants to present that evidence in an ethical manner. After addressing the issue of evidence usage in both debate and individual events, the Sedalia Conference offered the following resolution:

Evidence should be evaluated not by its quantity, but by its quality determined in part by its credibility and audience acceptability. Thoroughness and care must be exercised in finding, recording, and documenting evidence. Advocates should recognize their ultimate responsibility for all evidence they use, whether discovered by them or by others (McBath, 1976, p. 33).

The conference report noted that discussion following this resolution focused on the concern for both inappropriate and inaccurate use of evidence. For the most part, the conferees believed that inaccuracies in evidence usage were the result of carelessness or deliberate distortion. Regardless of intent, however, forensic scholars viewed ethical evidence usage as the responsibility of the individual competitor in contest speaking. In addition, the conferees noted that even if the evidence had been commercially reproduced with inaccuracies, the user, is still accountable for its ethical consideration in the contest setting (McBath, 1976).

A decade later, the Second National Conference on Forensics at Northwestern University once again wrestled with issues surrounding ethical conduct in forensics. While there was no lengthy discussion focused on the ethical use of evidence reported in the proceedings, the conferees did endorse the following resolution:

2. THE AMERICAN FORENSIC ASSOCIATION SHOULD PUBLISH AND DISSEMINATE A SPEAKER'S GUIDEBOOK OF SCHOLARLY CITATIONS TO ASSIST STUDENTS IN PROPERLY CREDITING MATERIALS USED IN FORENSIC COMPETITION (Parson, 1984, p. 19).

The brief discussion that followed the proposed resolution suggested that such a guidebook would provide a standardized and commonly-accepted source within the forensic community to be used by students in the preparation of their oral and written presentations. Such a speaker's guidebook would help to educate the student so that citation errors due to ignorance could be minimized. In addition, such a guidebook would also help to educate the forensic coach/judge on accepted standards and criteria for evaluating the ethical use of evidence in original speeches. While this deliberative body strongly urged that the American Forensic Association undertake such a project, to date no single forensics organization has produced such a guidebook for student use.

Furthermore, the First Developmental Conference on Individual Events (1989) encouraged forensic organizations that currently have established, formalized codes of ethics to advertise and make available copies of these codes for coach and student use. While this recommendation did not specifically address the ethical concerns of evidence usage, standards for ethical use of evidence are specifically addressed in current codes of ethics established by such organizations as the American Forensic Association and the National Forensic Association. However, these conferees

-6-

recommended that the forensic community join together to establish a single code of ethics. As reported in the conference proceedings,

...a single unified code of ethics governing forensic activities which is endorsed and supported by all national, regional, and state organizations in desirable (Schnoor & Karns, 1989, p. 93).

Following this recommendation, the conferees suggested that the Council of Forensic Organizations may be the appropriate body to establish such a unified code.

Historically, then, the forensic community has both identified and strongly reiterated the need for clearly-defined, well-established, and widely-distributed guidelines for ethical use of evidence. In spite of such a resounding call for action, however, no single organization or combined effort in the forensic community has come forward to meet the challenge. Unfortunately, the forensic community continues to be plagued by claims that unethical use of evidence in public address events does occur even at the highest levels of competition.

The Unethical Use of Evidence Exists

When we consider the vast numbers of students who compete in public address events throughout the forensic season and whose ethical use of evidence is never questioned, it is difficult to speculate on how pervasive is the actual problem of unethical evidence usage. Perhaps it is reasonable to state that rarely do coaches and/or judges

-7-

complete a forensic season without questioning the ethical nature of evidence used a public address event at some time. Although not taking issue with the democratic philosophy, the defendant is innocent until proven guilty and most coaches/judges simply assume innocence because they don't have the time or tools necessary to investigate potential ethical abuses of evidence usage sufficiently. As a result, students may never really be held accountable for their ethical use of evidence throughout the forensic season. The irony is that usually only if the speech is successful in national competition will it run the risk of being scrutinized for the student's ethical use of evidence. Unfortunately, those few nationally-successful speeches that have been studied have not fared well under the scrutiny.

It seems the individual events community is still somewhat limited in its study of evidence usage over the years. Perhaps the only published article on actual evidence usage in public address events is one that examines the six persuasive speaking finalists at the National Forensic Association's I.E. Nationals in 1981 (Frank, 1983). Results of this study reported instances of source and data fabrication, source deception (undisclosed sources, pseudo-citations, and source splitting), and even outright plagiarism. While not all of these uses of evidence may be deemed "unethical" by everyone in the individual events community, many individual events educators were surprised at the number of evidence uses that could clearly be labelled

"unethical" in these persuasive speeches that had been judged to be of such high quality.

Since 1983, this author could not locate similar published studies that examine actual use of evidence in public address events. However, two unpublished studies that do examine the ethical use of evidence in public address events also produce disturbing findings. Wayson (1989) examined the use of evidence in the National Forensic Association's 1987 National Champion in Informative Speaking. His analysis uncovered incidences of fabrication, source deception, and plagiarism in this speech. Fowler and McCafferty (1989) examined the National Forensic Association's 1986 National Final Round in Extemporaneous Speaking. Their findings also revealed instances of fabrication and source deception in varying degrees among the six speakers. While admittedly these studies examined only isolated cases, the fact that the few times researchers have analyzed evidence usage in public address events there appear to be ethical violations is cause for alarm. The issue of ethical evidence usage persists and the individual events community must take some concrete action to address this issue more conscientiously than we have in the past.

**Recommendations to Enhance the Ethical Use of Evidence
in Public Address Events**

1. Develop a Speaker's Guidebook

While forensic educators cannot eliminate a student's

conscious choice to engage in fabrication, source deception, or plagiarism, we can eliminate those instances of unethical evidence usage that result from ignorance. It is conceivable that some students as well as coaches simply may not understand the criteria that guide the ethical use of evidence in public address events; consequently, unethical choices in the use of evidence may actually be unintentional.

The forensic community not only has an opportunity to instruct students on this ethical issue, but I contend that the forensic community has the obligation to do so. While forensic educators must set the tone for the ethical choices their students make, the forensic community can develop a tool that will assist coaches with a variety of backgrounds, experiences, and expertise to teach the ethical use of evidence in public address events. Portions of the ethical codes already established by such organizations as the American Forensic Association and the National Forensic Association can provide the foundation for such a speaker's guide. Amplification of definitions coupled with clear examples of ethical/unethical, correct/incorrect, appropriate/inappropriate uses of evidence can provide a constant source of instruction for the student as well as the coach.

The forensic community identified the need to provide this information to students almost two decades ago, but during the ensuing two decades no concrete speaker's guide has been developed. The Council of Forensic Organizations,

-10-

as the representative body of the forensic community, should appoint a specific committee to begin work on this project immediately.

2. Require the Use of Complete Source Citations

A complete source citation is usually considered one that allows the source to be located with ease. While some educators may argue that students use incomplete source citations to deceive the listener, others argue that complete source citations in a speech disrupt the oral flow of the speech. Some forensic educators even question if the speaker should be held to the same documentation standards as the writer since the medium used to deliver the in competition is different. Regardless of the preferences of individual forensic educators, the forensic community as a whole should be explicit about what information constitutes a "complete" source citation and rigorously adhere to that definition in judging standards. For example, if standards for the oral and written presentations are decidedly different and the forensic community deems it appropriate to consider both sets of standards, some restriction on source citations may be deemed appropriate for the oral presentation as long as a written bibliography is provided for the judge and audience before or after the speech is given. Regardless of the option chosen, guidelines for complete source citations with examples must be provided in the speaker's guidebook.

-11-

3. Re-examine the Quantity and Quality Standards Used to Evaluate Evidence

Frank (1983) identified two forms of source deception typically found to occur in the unethical use of evidence: 1) pseudo-citations--the citing of the secondary source rather than the primary source and 2) source-splitting--dividing the details found in one source, attributing one detail in one part of the speech to one part of the source and attributing another detail in another part of the speech to another part of the source. While some forensic educators may be reluctant to label these techniques as "unethical," the forensic community cannot ignore the nature of an activity that may encourage such deception to attain success.

Unfortunately, students who use these techniques may feel the need to create the illusion of using many more sources than were actually used in the speech or the need to disguise a published source that may not be perceived as credible by the judge. Specifically, the forensic community may set an unrealistic standard concerning the number of sources that are appropriate and even desirable for a ten-minute speech. This unrealistic expectation may encourage students to value the quantity rather than the quality of evidence used in their speeches.

Furthermore, the forensic community may be quick to place great value on the use of technical information printed in professional publications rather than the use of credible information written for a general audience and printed in a

-12-

publication geared to a general readership. After all, both the students and the judges are, for the most part, members of the general population for the majority of topics used in public address events. Again, it seems ironic to me that an article written for a general audience--often one that cites reputable experts--is the article that usually captures the student's interest in pursuing the topic.

While students should certainly explore all facets of a topic and seek challenging research, more than one forensic educator can probably recall an example of a student who wanted to cite a credible expert who provided a clear, concise, explanation of the topic written in Reader's Digest or Cosmopolitan. Although the same expert had written for technical journals, the explanation provided for the general audience in the questionable source was much more appropriate for the general audience who would evaluate this speech. The ethical dilemma then becomes whether to abandon a solid piece of supporting evidence or disguise it as a pseudo-cite because the forensic community will condemn use of the primary source. In developing a speaker's guidebook, the forensic community should re-examine some of the implicit standards it holds that may, in fact, create ethical dilemmas for the student.

Conclusion

Issues surrounding the ethical use of evidence in the public address events have concerned the forensic community

-13-

over the last two decades. While forensic educators have clearly identified and reiterated the need for explicit guidelines on evidence usage, no organization in the forensic community has undertaken the development of a speaker's guidebook. Using current codes of ethics as a basis and considering some of the implicit expectations that serve to perpetuate ethical dilemmas may prove useful in developing a speaker's guidebook that will be valuable as an educational tool for the entire forensic community.

REFERENCES

- Faules, D. F., Rieke, R. D., & Rhodes, J. (1976). Directing Forensics. Denver: Morten Publishing Co.
- Fowler, D. B., & McCafferty, J. E., III. (1989, November). Evidentiary analysis of extemporaneous speaking at the national level: Use and abuse of source citations. Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association Annual Convention, San Francisco, CA.
- Frank, R. L. (1983). The abuse of evidence in persuasive speaking. National Forensic Journal, 1(2), 97-108.
- Friedley, Sheryl A. (1983). Ethics and evidence usage: Current 'codes' in individual events. National Forensic Journal, 1(2), 109-117.
- Klopf, D. W., & Lahman, C. P. (1976). Coaching and Directing Forensics. Skokie, IL: National Textbook Co.
- McBath, J. H. (Ed.) (1976). Forensics as Communication. Skokie, IL: National Textbook Co.
- Parson, D. (Ed.) (1984). American Forensics in Perspective. Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association.
- Schnoor, L., & Karns, V. (Eds.) (1989). Perspective on Individual Events: Proceedings of the First Developmental Conference on Individual Events. Mankato, MN: Mankato State University.
- Thomas, D. A. (1983). The ethics of proof in speech events: A survey of standards used by contestants and judges. National Forensic Association, 1(2), 1-2.
- Wayson, K. W. C. (1989, November). Dust in the wind: Ethics in informative speaking. Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association Annual Convention, San Francisco, CA.

A VALUE APPROACH: SOME NOTES TOWARD THE EDUCATIONAL/COMPETITIVE ASPECTS OF FORENSIC PROGRAMS

A VALUE APPROACH: SOME NOTES TOWARD THE EDUCATIONAL/COMPETITIVE ASPECTS OF FORENSIC PROGRAMS

NATIONAL DEVELOPMENTAL CONFERENCE
ON INDIVIDUAL EVENTS
DENVER, COLORADO
SUMMER, 1990

JAN J. YOUNGER
HEIDELBERG COLLEGE
TIFFIN, OHIO 44883

In discussing the spirit of campus life, Ernest Boyer in his work entitled College: The Undergraduate Experience stated:

The undergraduate college should be held together by something more than plumbing, a common grievance over parking or football rallies in the fall. What students do in the dining halls, on the playing fields, and in the rathskeller late at night all combine to influence the outcomes of the college education and the challenge, in the building of community, is to extend the resources for learning on the campus and see the academic and non-academic life as interlocked.¹

Clearly, the experience in forensics "holds together" the campus experience for a significant group of students. What these students do while on a forensic trip, in tournament competitions, in van discussions, and in fast food restaurants all combine to condition and influence the outcome of their college education. Yet, little is written concerning the "interlocked" academic and non-academic forensic experience. The focus of this paper will concern itself with the implications of the dual educational/competitive aspects of the collegiate individual events program.

In specifically pointing to the goals of undergraduate education, Boyer concluded:

but in the end, students must be inspired by a larger vision, using the knowledge they have acquired to discover patterns, **FORM VALUES** (emphasis added), and advance the common good. The undergraduate experience at its best will move the student from competence to commitment.²

With this goal of commitment in mind, it appeared crucial to examine the implicit and explicit values inherent in a co-curricular forensic program. The formulation of values that result from the educational/competitive implications of forensics should not be serendipitous.

ABSTRACT

Jan J. Younger, "A Values Approach: Some Notes Toward The Educational/Competitive Aspects of Forensic Programs." National Developmental Conference on Individual Events, Denver, Colorado, Summer, 1990.

This study attempted to investigate the educational/competitive values in co-curricular forensics programs. The study made two major assumptions (1) that individual events programs should be linked to the curriculum and (2) that the identification and development of educational values would contribute to the improvement of forensic instruction.

It was the purpose of this study to offer an examination of five current studies in higher education suggesting curricular reform. These studies included; (a) Involvement in Learning: Realizing the Potential of American Higher Education (1984), (b) Project on Redefining the Meaning and Purpose of Baccalaureate Degrees (1985), (c) The report entitled "To Reclaim a Legacy," (1984) (d) College: The Undergraduate Experience (1987), and (e) 50 Hours: A Core Curriculum for College Students. (1989) In addition, the study's purpose was to design a perspective for the identification and development of specific values in co-curricular forensic instruction. Finally, the study provided an analysis of value-oriented teaching strategies and their implications for the forensic community. The study found that the traditional forensic tournament as an instructional model was affirmed, and that three clusters of values in the non-academic aspect of the forensic program were deemed important. These clusters included (1) a sense of trust, acceptance, and belonging, (2) a sense of responsibility and self respect, and (3) a sense of accomplishment.

The Purpose of the Study: It was the purpose of this study to offer (1) an examination of the five current studies in higher education suggesting curricular reform - especially noting their recommendations for the teaching of values. (2) to provide a brief perspective for the identification and development of specific values into co-curricular forensic instruction and (3) an analysis of values strategies and their implications for the forensic community.

Higher Education's Response of Value Crisis

Recently, our mass media have been busy reporting some some kind of ethical crisis. Scam artists appear to be everywhere. Business has witnessed Ivan Boesley and Clifford Irving, politics has seen John Tower, Jim Wright, and David Durkenberger, while religion has viewed the ethical demise of such leaders as Jim & Tammy Baker and Jimmy Swaggert. Education has not been exempt. In an ABC special report entitled Lying, Cheating, and Stealing in America, Sam Donaldson reported that a college president, Diego A. Navarrette, Jr., in Tucson, Arizona was forced to resign following the claim that he had a Masters degree when records showed he didn't; Miss Florida State University, Kim Hughes, was forced to resign her title because a friend used a fake identification card to take a math test for her, and, finally, university students in Ames, Iowa were accused of stealing state equipment to make hundreds of fake drivers licenses.³

Throughout the 1980's colleges and universities have not been silent with regard to these highly publicized endless breaches of conduct in society. A series of reports have underlined strong measures to encourage more effective teaching efforts. These reports suggest that more and more people - especially young people at the undergraduate level - seem to be leading their lives without clear purpose or

direction. All of these reports indicate that undergraduate education has not been responsive to the value needs of students. These national reports issued in the eighties appear to signal higher education's concern for the quality of education. The authors and titles of these major reports are (1) the Study Group on the Conditions of Excellence in American Higher Education report entitled "Involvement in Learning: Realizing the Potential of American Higher Education" (1984), (2) the Association of American Colleges Committee report entitled "Project on Redefining the Meaning and Purpose of Baccalaureate Degrees" (1985), (3) William Bennett's report entitled "To Reclaim a Legacy" (1984), (4) Ernest Boyer's College: The Undergraduate Experience (1987), and (5) Lynne V. Cheney's 50 Hours: A Core Curriculum for College Students. These five reports address the failures of undergraduate programs to meet the needs of their students, and each has offered specific remedies for higher education to follow. Each of these reports has dealt with the issue of values education either implicitly or explicitly.

In the opening paragraph of the text "Involvement in Learning: Realizing the Potential of American Higher Education" the authors explicitly stressed the importance of shared values in society and education. In this opening section entitled "A Matter of Trust", the report stated:

We write from a set of shared values about higher education in the United States. These values guided our discussion and shaped our analysis, conclusions and recommendations. They form the cornerstones of our renewal we hope will result from our efforts, the goals we trust our readers will share with us.

The United States must become a nation of educated people. Its citizens should be knowledgeable, creative, and open to ideas. Above all, they should learn how to learn so they can pursue knowledge throughout their lives and assist their children in the same quest....

To assure excellence, our colleges, community colleges and universities should establish and maintain high standards of student and institutional performance....⁴

The major thrust of the report details the learning outcomes, goals, and directions in higher education for student involvement, educational institution's commitments toward realization of expectations, a system for assessment and providing feedback, and, finally, the implications of the conditions for excellence.

Thus, the report "Involvement in Learning: Realizing the Potential of American Higher Education" explicitly stressed that "shared values" form the cornerstones of the renewal of excellence in higher education. These values should guide the direction of students, institutions and faculty in their attempts to realize the full potential of higher education.

One year later, a second panel addressed the undergraduate curriculum and called for its immediate reform. The panel represented the Association of American Colleges and included such esteemed members as Ernest Boyer, president, Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, David W. Breneman, president, Kalamazoo College, and Marks H. Curtis, president, Association of American Colleges. This reported was entitled "Project on Redefining the Meaning and Purpose of Baccalaureate Degrees"; it called the bachelors degree "meaningless" and asked professors "to lead in its restoration."⁵

In the section of the report outlining minimum requirements, the panel reported its concern for the teaching of values in the undergraduate program. In addressing the importance and the method of teaching values, the authors warned: "Students must learn to make real choices, assume responsibilities for their decisions, be comfortable with their own behavior, and know why."⁶

Continuing to point to the importance of values education for students, the report stated, "They must embody the values of a democratic society in order to fulfill the responsibilities of citizenship. They must be equipped to be perceptive and wise critics of that society, repositories of the values that make civilized and humane society possible."⁷

Stressing the importance of teaching value choice, decision, and judgement in a course of study, the report suggested

We may be wary of final answers, but we cannot avoid the necessity of choice, decision, judgement. The curricular opportunities are legion: Abraham Lincoln willing to accept a constitutional amendment protecting slavery in the South in order to frustrate secession; Captain Vere wrestling with complex issues of innocence and justice, good and evil in Billy Budd; the tension between neighborhood and urban renewal in the city of your choice; Who owns the Elgin marbles?; equity in the tax structure; barriers to voter registration, immigration, and imports; Vietnam, Iran, Grenada - the choices and values; Holocaust - evil and guilt; Los Alamos - a scientific community in the real world; an inquiry into human tragedy in literature; crime and punishment.⁸

Accusing teachers, the report stated

The opportunities are there, but they are too seldom taken by teachers so far gone into specialization and into the scientific understandings of their specialities that the challenges of bringing students into humanistic relationship with their subjects, into values and choice and judgement, are beyond their interest and capacity.⁹

In providing a remedy, the report stated

Recruiting teachers with a professional commitment to teaching may be one way to focus subject matter on life, its quality, the agonies and joys, the demands and choices of growing up.¹⁰

Thus, a major contention in this report called for a more meaningful undergraduate degree. The teaching of values - choice, decision, and judgement were deemed crucial to the restoration of integrity in the bachelor's degree. The report urged professors to use the opportunities provided by the curriculum to teach value decisions that profoundly affected history, literature and other courses of study.

In the third report, William Bennett's publication entitled "To Reclaim a Legacy", Bennett assailed the state of humanities on campus. In this report, the recommendation's section entitled "What Should Be Read" appeared to be of

importance to values education and in particular to the speech - communication teacher. Bennett's list included The Federalist Papers (as a list of editorials), speeches from Lincoln, King, Twain and Faulkner, and the Lincoln-Douglas debates.⁹ Although Bennett does not explicitly argue for values education, the report argued for the teaching of values (1) contained in selected works, (2) in the transmission of culture and (3) found in the intellectual legacy of Western civilization. Indeed, writers like Nelson,¹² Hirsch,¹³ Krauthammer,¹⁴ and Lipset¹⁵ have argued that culture - especially American culture-acts as in principal source of learned values.

The fourth major report of the eighties was Ernest Boyer's College: The Undergraduate Experience. The goal of the report according to Boyer was "to consider the undergraduate experience in America", and "to pay particular attention to the way the structures and procedures of colleges affect the lives of students".¹⁶ In this quest, attention to values appeared to surface in at least three major areas of discussion-the college's mission statements, the academic program, and the campus life. In the discussion of the mission statements of American colleges, Boyer found repeatedly two powerful traditions - individuality and community - were at the heart of the undergraduate experience. Expressing the value of these two traditions, Boyer concluded:

The college, at its best, recognizes that although we live alone, we also are deeply dependent on each other. Through an effective college education students should become personally experienced and also committed to a common good.¹⁷

In the discussion of the undergraduate academic experience, Boyer cited one of the courses found at Saint Anselm College for excellence. The course was built on the theme "Portraits of Human Greatness." This interdisciplinary program which views general education from a historical perspective focuses on moral and ethical

questions surrounding selected periods in history and studies the vocations of influential people.¹⁸

In the discussion of campus life, Boyer appeared to suggest that value's education was an appropriate responsibility for the entire college. Boyer wrote,

The undergraduate college should be held together by something more than plumbing, a common grievance over parking, or football rallies in the fall. What students do in dining halls, on the playing fields, and in the rathskellar late at night all combine to influence the outcome of higher education, and the challenge, in the building of community, is to extend the resources for learning on the campus and to see academic and non-academic life as interlocked.¹⁹

Probably the most directive curricular reform was provided by Lynne V. Cheney's 30 Hours: A Core Curriculum for College Students. This National Endowment for the Humanities study argued for requiring 18 hours in Cultures and Civilization, 12 hours in foreign language, 6 hours in concepts in mathematics, 8 hours in foundations of the natural sciences and 6 hours in the social sciences and the modern world.²⁰ It should be noted speech communication was specifically omitted from this required list. Although the oratory of Webster, Lincoln, Chief Joseph, and King and the poetry of Whitman, Dickson and Frost were mentioned as recommended studies in American civilization, the teaching of these traditionally speech communication kinds of studies was left to teachers of history and literature.

In addition to these five major reports in the 1980's, individuals have responded to the perceived values problems in higher education. In an interview in U.S. News and World Report, Steven Muller, President of Johns Hopkins University undoubtedly overstated the case when he said that "universities are turning out potentially high skilled barbarians" and proceeded to go on to cite the lack of values teaching and that the university has lost its "source for a coherent value system as causes for these kinds of problems."²¹

In speaking of the lack of ethical conduct and standards for college football, the deposed coach of Oklahoma University, Barry Switzer, joined President Muller in overstatement when he stated:

My student handbook at Oklahoma has a code of conduct and I never thought about saying Don't shoot your roommate, don't deal drugs, and don't rape.²²

Yet, all three violations actually occurred on the Oklahoma team in the late 1980's.

The most pertinent and balanced look at the problem seemed to be found in Richard Morrill's book entitled Teaching Values in College. Sketching the history of values education in college, Morrill stated:

The mission of American colleges and universities has been strongly shaped by a historical commitment to moral education. This special attention to moral education has emerged from a variety of sources and has appeared in countless forms and under many names. It was inspired by the venerable inheritance of Greek philosophy, informed by the wisdom of European thinkers and practitioners, guided by the model of the British schools and colleges, and implemented in the characteristic American spirit of moral activism.²³

Although Morrill offered this picture linking the historical development of moral education to the mission and history of higher education, Morrill extended his analysis to a sketch of the renewed emphasis on moral education and its most apparent goals. Arguing the goals that moral education attempts to achieve, Morrill listed:

1. introduce normative inquiry into higher learning, in order to supplement the typically narrow and value-free methodology of contemporary academic skepticism;
2. revitalize federal education, especially the humanities, and restore the integrative focus that has been lost;
3. provide students with an effective and rigorous preparation for dealing adequately with critical human choices, especially those that have moral consequences;

4. provide an education that affects both conduct and thought, the formation of character as well as the development of intellect.²⁴

Thus, higher education has witnessed a society confronting significant issues of value. National reports on education have underscored the importance of teaching values in the classroom. It would appear the teaching of competitive speech has not escaped ethical issues in its practice.

VALUES AND THE INDIVIDUAL EVENTS INSTRUCTION

Forensics has not been immunized against this societal value disorder. McBath²⁵ and Parsons²⁶ each reported on ethical issues touching forensics. More recently, the National Forensic Association's statement on plagiarism²⁷ and the discussion concerning the drafting of a statement "protecting literary integrity" at the 1990 National Individual Events tournament's coaches meeting²⁸ seemed to suggest ethical questions surround both the public speaking and the interpretative events.

At least two dimensions of value teaching appeared relevant to the teaching of forensics. The first addressed the identification of certain values important to individual forensic programs, and the second spoke to the development of values within the forensic teaching model.

Identification Milton Rokeach noted that Kluckhohn's basic definition (conceptions of the desirable) is the most widely cited, his own definition refines and moves toward a more operational approach.

A value is an enduring belief that a specific mode of conduct or end-state existence is personally or socially preferable to an opposite or converse mode of conduct or end-state of existence. A value system is an enduring organization of beliefs concerning desirable modes of conduct or end-states of existence along a continuum of relative importance.²⁹

Rokeach believed that there are values basic to all people. His value test included 18 terminal values, desirable end-states, and 18 instrumental values, means or standards. (See APPENDIX A).

It would appear several of these values are important to a wide variety of forensic programs, state forensic associations, as well as, national forensic associations. The National School Board Association considered the following values crucial to "a democratic and humane society" - altruism, compassion, courage, courtesy, generosity, honesty, industriousness, integrity, loyalty, obedience, punctuality, respect for authority, responsibility, self discipline, self respect, and tolerance.³⁰ Although this list does overlap, and in some cases, repeat the terminal and instrumental values of Rokeach, they provided a perspective relative to teaching and education that appeared significant. Since forensic programs differ widely and are located in disparate kinds of colleges and universities across the United States, no attempt was made to attribute values to individual programs.

Development: Forensic instruction can be developed using value centered materials. In addressing this process, McCaleb and Dean cited the work of Harvard University's William Perry as a learning model.³¹ Perry (1970) devised a scheme of development that involved four major transitional phases: (1) dualism - simplistic thinking that is controlled by external authorities to whom the individual looks for the "right" answer, (2) multiplicity - recognition of a "right" process through which answers are sought, (3) relativism - shifting the focus of control from an external to an internal source so that personal responsibility is accepted for decisions made, and (4) commitment - realization of the interrelation between decision making and self identity and the acknowledgement of one's morality.³²

McCaleb and Dean used the forensic program to illustrate the Perry scheme.

They wrote:

Many novices, in Perry's dualistic phase, rely absolutely on the opinions of the coach whom the novice views as "truth" or "right." By promoting multiplicity, the coach leads these eager learners from the "right" answer toward a command of effective processes that enable students to produce answers of their own.³³

Pointing to the final direction of the process, they concluded:

As the student gains in experience and confidence more decisions are made without consulting the coach (who has become less of an authority figure) and the competitor assumes greater responsibility for making decisions.³⁴

Clearly, the forensic community has had to address questions of ethics and values in its developmental conference as well as in its tournament practices. These questions of value are critical to forensic instruction. While forensic instruction is not and should not be substituted for courses in ethics, the values integrated in the study of forensics should be further identified and developed.

However, forensic instruction as a learning activity appears suited for the teaching of skills necessary for values education. Forensic instruction provides time for students to choose from alternatives, weigh consequences of each alternative, share and publicly affirm their choice and to evaluate and assess consequences of their public affirmation. This process has the design to encourage the development of student autonomy.

VALUE STRATEGIES AND THEIR PROGRAMATIC IMPLICATIONS

The recent studies on curriculum reform have caused colleges and universities to examine and assess their approaches to the teaching of values. These curricular

studies appear to have some significant implications for the co-curricular forensic community. It was felt these studies may be addressed by (1) an analysis of the implications for an individual forensic program and (2) an analysis of their impact on state and national organizations.

INDIVIDUAL FORENSIC PROGRAM. The individual forensic program appeared to be an excellent example of Boyer's "interlocking academic and non-academic experience." Recent studies in curriculum may help to clarify and underscore traditional values of the academic nature of individual events programs as well as their non-academic nature.

The Academic Life. The text of the report on excellence in undergraduate education entitled *Involvement in Learning* details the values of goal setting, student involvement, a system of assessment and feedback and conditions for excellence that appear to echo the traditional forensic tournament as an instructional model. The text of the report entitled *Project on Redefining the Meaning and Purpose of the Baccalaureate Degrees* pointed to the importance of teaching value choice, decision, and judgement in order to prepare for citizenship in a democratic society.

If responsible communication, basic to the American system is to serve democracy properly then forensic skills must be continued as essential educational disciplines. The Delphi study conceived to aid the Sedalia conference unanimously concluded; "Forensic directors should be more concerned about developing students abilities in analyzing controversies, building cases, developing communication skills, and less concerned with winning, developing reputations and collecting and processing information."³⁵ Bennett and Cheney, in their respective reports, called for studying specific kinds of persuasion, oratory, and approaches to poetry and literature. Forensic tournaments with their emphasis on communication analysis, public speaking and interpretative events appear to match those academic challenges.

The Non-Academic Life. Although academic integrity is probably the core value in most forensic programs, the non-academic aspects of a forensic program are crucially important to its success as a campus activity. At least these value

oriented aspects of the non-academic aspect of a forensic program appear important to note.

- 1) **Trust, Acceptance, and Belonging.** The concept of team appears in the parlance, research and in our award assemblies. The values inherent in the building of a team concept in a forensic program can be a significant part of the success of an individual program. Clearly, the commonality of tournament experience contributes heavily toward this concept.
- 2) **Responsibility and Self Respect.** The concept of understanding self, the forensic team, and the college is a difficult challenge for many students. Although the forensic coach is primarily a teacher, he/she may often be cast in the role of adviser, counselor, or mentor in the personal development of college students.
- 3) **A Sense of Accomplishment.** Rokeach argued the sense of accomplishment was one of the top terminal values for education.³⁶ The concept of achieving and progressing in tournament competition under the educational guidelines of goals, involvement, assessment and challenging standards was deemed valuable in forensic activity. However, the social perspective derived from forensics sometimes calls for an understanding of how ability and award becomes casual rather than casual in their formation. This integration of conflicting values is a challenging situation for both student and coach.

STATE AND NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS. These studies pose a unique challenge to state and national forensic organizations. The emphasis on the values inherent in pursuit of excellence and equality will require constant vigilance. The traditional forensic tournament model has been reaffirmed as a substantive educational paradigm. The creative or imaginative dimension of these organizations appeared to be the most vulnerable. The traditional events are not always adaptable to changing educational trends. A possible solution may be the adoption of a "creative event." A creative event (experimental/wild card) that would address relevance, timeliness, and activeness of experimentation in the field. This kind of event may provide the organizations with a structure for adaptability and versatility required to meet future changes.

END NOTES

- 1 Ernest Boyer, College: The Undergraduate Experience (New York: Harper and Row, Publisher, 1987) p.
- 2 *Ibid.*
- 3 "Lying, Cheating and Stealing in America," ABC's Burning Questions aired June 1, 1989, Toledo, Ohio; Channel 24 WNWO.
- 4 "Text of New Report on Excellence in Undergraduate Education," The Chronicle of Higher Education. October 24, 1984, p. 35.
- 5 "Integrity in the College Curriculum," The Chronicle of Higher Education. February 13, 1985, p. 1.
- 6 *Ibid.* p. 13.
- 7 *Ibid.* p. 20.
- 8 *Ibid.* p. 21.
- 9 *Ibid.*
- 10 *Ibid.*
- 11 "Endowment Chief Assails State of the Humanities," The Chronicle of Higher Education. November 28, 1984, p. 1.
- 12 Jack Nelson, Values and Society (New Jersey: Hayden Book Company Inc., 1975) p. 15-17.
- 13 E.D. Hirsch, Jr., Cultural Literacy (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1987), p. 98-99.
- 14 Charles Krauthammer, "Bennett and His Sectarian Allies," Washington Post. August 23, 1985.
- 15 Seymour M. Lipset (ed.), Culture and Social Character (New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, Inc. 1961), p. 89-175.
- 16 Ernest Boyer, "Foreword", College: The Undergraduate Experience (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1987), p. XI.
- 17 *Ibid.* p. 69.
- 18 *Ibid.* p. 95.

- 19 *Ibid.* p. 177.
- 20 Lynne V. Cheney, 50 Hours: A Core Curriculum for College Students (Washington D.C.: National Endowment for the Humanities, 1989) p. 17.
- 21 Alvin P. Sanoff, "A Conversation with Steven Muller," U.S. News and World Report. November 10, 1980, p. 57.
- 22 Valerie Lynn Dorsey, "Update", USA Today, June 9, 1989, p. 15C.
- 23 Richard L. Morrill, "Teaching Values in College," (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1980) p. 1.
- 24 *Ibid.* p. 7.
- 25 James H. McBath (ed.), Forensics as Communication (Skokie, Ill., National Textbook Co., 1975) p. 63-81.
- 26 Don W. Parson (ed.), American Forensics in Perspective (Annadale, Va., Speech Communication Association, 1984) p. 13-22.
- 27 National Forensic Association Tournament Announcement 1990. November, 1989.
- 28 Personal notes of author.
- 29 Milton Rokeach, The Nature of Human Values (New York, Free Press 1973) p. 5.
- 30 Valerie Lynn Dorsey, "Update", USA Today, June 9, 1989.
- 31 Joseph L. McCaleb and Kevin W. Dean, "Ethics and Communication Education: Empowering Teachers", Communication Education, October 1987, p. 410-416.
- 32 *Ibid.*
- 33 *Ibid.*
- 34 *Ibid.*
- 35 John C. Reinard and John E. Crawford, "Project Delphi: Assessment of Value Judgements on Forensics" contained in Forensics as Communication 1975.
- 36 Rokeach. p. 263.

APPENDIX A

The Value Survey

Terminal Values	Instrumental Values
A COMFORTABLE LIFE (a prosperous life)	AMBITIOUS (hard-working, aspiring)
AN EXCITING LIFE (a stimulating, active life)	BROADMINDED (open-minded)
A SENSE OF ACCOMPLISHMENT (lasting contribution)	CAPABLE (competent, effective)
A WORLD AT PEACE (free of war and conflict)	CHEERFUL (lighthearted, joyful)
A WORLD OF BEAUTY (beauty of nature and the arts)	CLEAN (neat, tidy)
EQUALITY (brotherhood, equal opportunity for all)	COURAGEOUS (standing up for your beliefs)
FAMILY SECURITY (taking care of loved ones)	FORGIVING (willing to pardon others)
FREEDOM (independence, free choice)	HELPFUL (working for the welfare of others)
HAPPINESS (contentedness)	HONEST (sincere, truthful)
INNER HARMONY (freedom from inner conflict)	IMAGINATIVE (daring, creative)
MATURE LOVE (sexual and spiritual intimacy)	INDEPENDENT (self-reliant, self-sufficient)
NATIONAL SECURITY (protection from attack)	INTELLECTUAL (intelligent, reflective)
PLEASURE (an enjoyable, leisurely life)	LOGICAL (consistent, rational)
SALVATION (saved, eternal life)	LOVING (affectionate, tender)
SELF-RESPECT (self-esteem)	OBEDIENT (dutiful, respectful)
SOCIAL RECOGNITION (respect, admiration)	POLITE (courteous, well-mannered)
TRUE FRIENDSHIP (close companionship)	RESPONSIBLE (dependable, reliable)
WISDOM (a mature understanding of life)	SELF-CONTROLLED (restrained, self-disciplined)

*Copyright 1967, Milton Rokeach. Form D published by Halgren Tests, 873 Persimmon Ave., Sunnyvale, California 94087.

1

Lending a Helping Hand
2

**Lending a Helping Hand:
Some Suggestions for "Common Sense Meddling"**

**James K. Dittus
Department of Speech Communication
University of Nebraska-Lincoln**

ABSTRACT

Scholarship in forensics tends to be directed at the experienced coach and the more developed programs. However, it is important to remember that there does exist lesser developed and new programs directed by inexperienced directors. This paper suggests some very basic steps the forensics community could take to help these programs develop, including: workshops for new directors, mentor-type assistance, the provision of a division for competition among less advanced students, and more scholarship in the "basics" of program administration.

Running Head: Lending a Helping Hand

Lending a Helping Hand
3

Lending a Helping Hand:

Some Suggestions for "Common Sense Meddling"

Little has been written about developing and sustaining new forensics programs. Occasionally an article will discuss an innovative funding mechanism (i.e. Kelley, 1984), or describe ways to strengthening existing programs (Greenstreet, Harris, Littlefield and Underberg, 1989), which may help new programs. Rarely, however, do articles specifically address how to help new programs develop and grow. I feel we need to focus more on the unique interests and problems of new programs, especially those with inexperienced directors.

There may be specific reasons for a lack of interest in these unique concerns. For one, we generally do not like to meddle in other people's affairs. Also, we tend to expect that forensics programs will be run by people familiar with forensics activities. Finally, these issues seem to be ignored because they are perceived as being too obvious to discuss.

These reasons are based on certain assumptions which are not necessarily valid. While, it is true that

Lending a Helping Hand
4

some schools seek out an experienced person to direct their program, others are turned over to inexperienced directors. For example, recently I received a job announcement for a Director of Forensics position which required certain teaching skills, but considered experience in forensics helpful but not necessary. Inexperienced directors may very well want some help from the forensics community, and probably would not perceive that assistance as "meddling." For instance, while determining what tournaments to attend seems obvious to experienced coaches, such decisions may be very difficult for a first time director. These are the people and programs the forensics community should try to help. Certainly this will transcend new programs. But, it is less likely that a well developed program will have to settle for an inexperienced coach. Besides, the best way to maintain growth and development in the activity is to insure a good experience for all programs, old and new. This paper identifies specific actions the experienced members of the forensics community can take to help achieve that goal. I like to think of these efforts as "common sense meddling."

Lending a Helping Hand
51. Helping out before the tournament

Many experienced directors can easily plan their season. Using their years of experience, and/or the AFA calender, they determine where they are going, what students they will take, and so on. People who have travelled the circuit for a few years can do this very quickly. They know the tournaments, their strengths and weaknesses, how large they are, and how good the competition is. They use this information to determine how each tournament fits their goals. But what about new coaches? To them every tournament looks the same. Throwing darts, tarot cards and drawing lots can replace good solid planning. Especially for new programs, which are generally on limited budgets, or who are struggling for institutional recognition, the wrong choice can be disastrous.

We need to find ways to share knowledge about these and other facets of program administration with new coaches and programs. Two mechanisms seem reasonably obvious: workshops and mentors.

WORKSHOPS

Colleges around the country offer institutes to high school and college students in all facet of

Lending a Helping Hand
6

forensics. It seems ironic that we can acknowledge the need to bring in new competitors to the activity, but not the need to bring in new coaches and programs. Workshops can serve as an excellent opportunity to bring together new coaches and "old hands." If scheduled prior to the season, new coaches would have an opportunity to better understand their job prior to embarking on the first season.

RECOMMENDATION I: Workshops should be organized to provide training for new coaches in all areas of program administration. The most logical sponsoring organizations would be state forensics associations like the Nebraska Intercollegiate Forensics Association. Chances are there will not be many new coaches each year, so the small geographic unit is best to reduce travel requirements.

MENTORS

The caveat on the number of attendees and the geographic coverage for these workshops raises an important point: not many new programs start every year

Lending a Helping Hand
7

and some hire an experienced coach. Therefore, the number of inexperienced coaches may be small enough to allow for one-on-one attention. This would seem to be the best way to help new programs: give new directors the exact information they need to run their programs. This could be accomplished through a "mentoring" program. Experienced directors would agree to help a new program in the same geographic area. This would provide new coaches with a specific person to contact if they had any questions. Depending on the resources of the mentors and the size of their squads they may even be able to share travel expenses with the new program.

RECOMMENDATION II: Experienced coaches should agree to help new programs by providing whatever assistance they can. Specifically, a mentor should be available to answer the most basic questions, and in addition, provide whatever additional support may be needed.

Obviously, new coaches need to know about these efforts or they are useless. Therefore, local organizations should inform schools considering new programs of this

Lending a Helping Hand
8

service. In addition to geographic proximity, the local organizations have an additional advantage in this process. Because they are closer to people in the area, local organizations are more likely to hear about the development of new programs.

2. Helping out at the tournament

Many fledgling programs struggle for administrative support. While it is unfortunate, some administrators tend to equate success with winning. However, it is often difficult for new programs to compete with existing programs. Therefore, we should adopt tournament procedures that allow these people to compete at their own level. At local tournaments a novice division should be created. At national tournaments, first year participants should be recognized.

NOVICE DIVISION

The creation of a novice level would allow students to get accustomed to the college circuit. This would help all first year students, but it will especially help new programs that do not have past experiences to learn from. While it would be nice to limit these divisions to only new programs, there probably are not enough new programs in a region to make this feasible at most

Lending a Helping Hand
9

tournaments. Thus the novice level could include all students in their first year of competition, who truly are not capable of competing at the senior level. I would like to propose some way to enforce that standard, but there truly is not any. Thus, if we wish to commit to the fostering of new programs, all coaches must recognize the spirit of the novice division.

As to the operation of the division, that could be left to individual tournament hosts. Some may choose to operate an entirely separate division. Others may opt for a system in which all students compete in one division, with the top competitors (novice or otherwise) advancing to finals. The remaining six highest novices compete in the novice final.

RECOMMENDATION III: Tournament directors should provide a novice division at their tournament, especially if there are a number of new programs in the area.

Some tournament directors claim that no one would enter these divisions. It may be that coaches currently enter their students in open competition because there

Lending a Helping Hand
10

is no other option. Tournament directors have nothing to lose by offering a novice division; if no one enters the division, it can just be canceled. However, even if a few students enter the division, it should be maintained.

NATIONAL COMPETITION

The problem of a small number of first year programs does not appear to be a problem at the national tournaments, at least in terms of first year participants. In fact from 1980-1989 an average of 14.5 new programs competed at the NFA National Tournament each year (Twenty Years of Champions, 1990). In addition more programs, especially newer ones, may attend national tournaments if they could compete (at least for one award) against other schools with equal experience. Establishing such an award would be easiest within the NFA structure, which already utilizes a stratified sweepstakes system. But the AFA should consider offering a competition among first year participants as well.

Lending a Helping Hand
11

RECOMMENDATION IV: The national tournaments should offer a special sweepstakes award to schools competing at a national tournament for the first time.

3. Some notes about scholarship in forensics

No one likes to work on an article that is likely to be rejected, and one of the most common reasons for rejection is that there is nothing new or innovative about an article. While articles about basic program operation probably fall into this category, some people would benefit from such articles. Therefore, we need to take steps to encourage scholarship in this area. One of the best ways to do this would be to dedicate one special issue to these concerns. Not only would a specific call for papers encourage submission of articles on these themes, but in the future the issue could be used as a "guidebook" for new directors.

Lending a Helping Hand
12

RECOMMENDATION V: One of the journals dealing with specific forensics issues should publish a special issue dedicated to basic program operation. Article topics could include: program administration, selecting tournaments, gaining publicity, and perhaps even travel tips.

Every program wants to be successful. At an administrative level, a successful program will justify continued funding and bring recognition to the school (which will also justify continued funding). Much as we hate to admit it, we live in a world of limited resources, and the continuation of any program depends on whether or not the administration believes that program is justifiable. At a more personal level, no one wants to be associated with an unsuccessful program.

It would seem that the best way to encourage the continuation of forensics programs is to do everything we can to foster a positive experience. The suggestions in this paper are a positive step in that direction, and I would encourage the forensics community to consider implementing these ideas.

Lending a Helping Hand
13

WORKS CITED

- Greenstreet, R. W. (1989). Earning support for individual events programs. In L. Schnoor & V. Karns (Eds.) Perspective on Individual Events: Proceedings of the First Developmental Conference on Individual Events. (pp. 70-73) Mankato, MN: Mankato State University.
- Harris, E. J. (1989). Strategies to enhancing university support for individual events programs. In L. Schnoor & V. Karns (Eds.) Perspective on Individual Events: Proceedings of the First Developmental Conference on Individual Events. (pp. 80-82). Mankato, MN: Mankato State University.
- Kelley, M. P. (1984). Funding forensics: The "IRA" alternative. National Forensic Journal, 11, 57-64.
- Littlefield, R. S. (1989). The cultivation of administrative and general support for individual events programs: Some practical suggestions. In L. Schnoor & V. Karns (Eds.) Perspective on Individual Events: Proceedings of the First Developmental Conference on Individual Events.

Lending a Helping Hand
14

- (pp. 73-77) Mankato, MN: Mankato State University.
- Twenty Years of Champions: The Individual Events National Championship Tournament. (1990). (Distributed by the NFA at the 1990 National Tournament.
- Underberg, L. (1989). Creating a climate of support for forensics programs. In L. Schnoor & V. Karns (Eds.) Perspective on Individual Events: Proceedings of the First Developmental Conference on Individual Events. (pp. 77-80) Mankato, MN: Mankato State University.