National Forensic Journal

The National Forensic Association is devoted to both education and competitive excellence in intercollegiate speech and debate.

National Forensic Journal

Submission Guidelines

The *National Forensic Journal* is a journal dedicated to ideas that affect the forensic community. Scholarship is accepted that is related to pedagogy, research, methodological issues, and administration in competitive individual events and debate activities. The goal of the journal is to facilitate systematic discussion among forensic educators and students in order to improve the quality of the educational experience. The Editorial Board will consider manuscripts that use any appropriate methodology. The journal welcomes submission by any interested person. While the scholarship need not specifically involve the forensic community, the conclusions drawn should have relevance to the activity. The journal uses a blind peer review policy. Manuscripts should be typed double-spaced throughout, including block quotations, notes, and references. Manuscripts should be prepared in accordance with the guidelines set forth by the 6th edition of the American Psychological Association (APA) *Publication Manual*. To facilitate blind   review, please avoid self-references in manuscript. Include on a separate page with author(s), academic titles,   institutional affiliations, contact information, and any manuscript history. The second page of the manuscript should   contain an abstract of no more than 200 words. The text should begin on the third page of the manuscript and should   include a title at the top of the page. Because manuscript distribution may be done through email correspondence,   please give the document a name that does not include author identity. While under review by the *National Forensic Journal*, authors may not submit the manuscript to another publication source. Articles should not be submitted that   have previously been published in whole in other sources. Upon acceptance, copyright for the article shall be retained   by the National Forensic Association. Authors are expected to follow the review guidelines established by their   institution's research review board for studies involving human participants. Manuscripts should be submitted as a Word attachment by email to rrichardson@berry.edu.

National Forensic Journal

Contents

Editor's Note

What are we teaching? The question, though rarely explicitly posed by forensic practitioners, has pervaded the foundational underpinnings of forensic scholarship for the past four decades. It looms behind numerous journal articles and conference presentations devoted to such topics as the nature of the various individual events, use of evidence, ballot writing, coaching, ethics and rules (both written and unwritten).

What are we teaching? The question lies just below the surface of three insightful articles offered by impressive young scholars in this issue. Sharples invites educators to consider the wealth of humor philosophy and scholarship when approaching after-dinner speaking. Mendes revives the issue of evidence misuse in persuasive speaking, an issue which challenges the validity and value of forensic activity. Kellam reminds rhetorical critics of the crucial connection between forensic language and forensic pedagogy. And while all three provide valuable additions to the scholarly lexicon of the various targeted events, the larger lessons offered to forensic professionals affirm principles which should anchor forensic philosophy and shape competitive practice. Namely, that **intercollegiate forensic education should be grounded in scholarship, preoccupied with ethics, and rhetorically sound.**

In recent years, national forensic organizations have explored pedagogical ground in writing and rewriting event descriptions. In 2010, the National Forensic Association released a report on pedagogy that addressed the teaching question directly. It represents a starting point for pedagogical assessment, not a final destination. In response to increasing institutional demands for learning assessment, and as a means of specifically documenting the educational value of forensic activity for forensic professionals, college administrators, professional colleagues and other interested parties, the National Forensic Association formed a committee to address the topic of forensic pedagogy. The report is not intended to be a handbook on how to do forensics the correct way. In fact, issues of performance methodology are, for the most part, avoided. The report was viewed as a way to connect the learning outcomes of forensics with those of communication departments and other academic disciplines. The report is included as an addition to this volume. While this is not a peer-reviewed document, it is the intention of the editors that the report will provide a useful reference for forensic educators.

Randy Richardson
Co-Editor

"Do You Know Why That's Funny?"
Connecting the Scholarship of Humor to the Practice
of After-Dinner Speaking

Adam J. Sharples
University of Alabama

Forensic educators have a unique opportunity to connect students with centuries of scholarship, yet it remains unclear how coaches utilize communication research to aid students in constructing events. This article questions how studies of humor can enhance connections between the forensic student and the broader field of research. Through applying theories of humor to the practice of After- Dinner Speaking (ADS), this paper indicates studies of humor in classical and contemporary scholarship provide useful frameworks in the construction of ADS, and offers suggestions for making more explicit connections between theory, pedagogy, and practice.

Encouraging a student to write their first after-dinner speech is a herculean task. While national out rounds of After-Dinner Speaking (ADS) are some of the most well-attended performances at national tournaments, yet they represent fewer number of speakers in competition when compared with Persuasion and Informative speaking events.[1] The novice forensic student relates to ADS in two ways: Novice students are sometimes drawn by the luster of making jokes to a captive audience and the opportunity to use skills developed from high school humorous interpretation. In this case, students fail to draw an appropriate distinction between argumentative humor and the practice of comedy; therefore, much negotiation is necessary to avoid humor solely for the sake of entertainment. At the same time, students fear they lack an inherent sense of comedy, retreat to other public address events, and never make the attempt. Students believe the event is best calibrated toward "naturally funny" (Dreibelbis & Redmon, 1987) and that success in the event does not involve learned behavior. Conversely, new forensic educators, graduate students and judges struggle with how to properly instruct and evaluate student performance in the event. As a result, students and coaches can be left to their own devices without understanding that, like other individual events, the use of humor in public speech has a home in academic research. While other public address events—notably Rhetorical Criticism and Persuasive Speaking—retain a fairly close connection with the communication discipline, students in ADS largely avoid centuries of research related to humor as a communicative phenomenon.

The gap between forensic pedagogy and research is a frequent topic among forensic scholars and practitioners (Croucher, 2006; Worth, 2002). Some have suggested

---

[1]While Dreibelbis & Redmon (1987) found that ADS had the fewest number of competitors, a review of the entries competing at the NFA national tournament in each event from the years 2010-2014 reveals ADS tends to rank in the bottom four individual events every year. While ADS has more participation than Rhetorical Criticism, it is still below Persuasive and Informative Speaking in popularity. The author would like to acknowledge NFA Tournament Director Dan Smith for his assistance in procuring this data.

that forensics offers an ideal place for participation and ethnographic study (Worth, 2002), or that forensic research has largely focused on how-to treatises on forensic pedagogy based upon experiential and anecdotal evidence (Croucher, 2006). A perceived lack of theoretical rigor has been correlated with a supposed "brain drain" (Preston, 1995, p. 16) as well as burnout of forensic educators that inevitably decreases the credibility of forensics as an academic function (Gill, 1990). Others suggest the bend toward circular research is motivated by the fact that individual events research is inextricably linked with a drive for competitive success (Burnett, Brand, & Meister, 2003). In their meta-analysis of forensic research, Kerber and Cronn-Mills (2005) warn "articles on individual events are applicable to their own area within forensics and not to the forensic community at large or to communication theory" (p. 77). Adding his voice to the growing concern, Croucher (2006) prefaced a special edition of the *National Forensic Journal* by articulating a void of theory in forensic research. Croucher described the need for forensic communities to incorporate communication theory into individual events research. Croucher posits forensics functions as an "educational laboratory that offers opportunities for scholars to study organization decision making and speaking skills in the real world" and calls for individual events research to provide a means of enhancing communication research (p. 6).

If forensics is to fully apply itself to the theoretical body of communication theory, then it is also imperative to apply communication theory to forensic practice. Forensic educators and coaches are gifted with a unique opportunity to draw connections between communication praxis and the practice of forensic performance. In the words of Kerber and Cronn-Mills (2005), forensic scholarship must "substantiate, extend, and integrate communication theory into the core practices of the individual events curriculum" (p. 79). While it is important to strengthen the connection between theory and research, the process of coaching forensic events also offers an opportunity to explicitly connect students with centuries of scholarship. Yet the question remains; what are the best ways for coaches to utilize communication research and help students construct events?

In the academic tradition of Gruner's (1985) "Advice to the Beginning Speaker on Using Humor," this article argues that studies of humor in classical and contemporary communication scholarship provide helpful frameworks in the construction of ADS. I question how rhetorical and interdisciplinary theories[2] of humor enhance connections between the forensic student and the broader field of communication studies. Through reviewing the literature and theories of humor, before applying these findings to the practice of ADS, this essay makes two simple but valuable observations. First, the study of humor in classical and contemporary scholarship provides a useful framework for the instruction of After-Dinner Speeches. Second, the process of making explicit connection between communication research and the coaching of communication is a fruitful and necessary endeavor for the progress and sustainability of the activity. The goal of this

---

[2] While this essay is presently focused on communication in a public forum, interpersonal communication, philosophy, and psychology are also interested in the ways humor impacts the receipt of a message, speaker credibility, and enhancing the relationship between those who use humor in communication processes. Thus, forensics students who desire for mastery of humor in public communication can gain advantage from understanding how humor functions in a variety of areas.

paper is not to make the specious assertion that all forensic educators do not incorporate theory and research findings into practice, nor is this to suggest that all forensic educators are without proper exposure and education to this literature. Rather, as Reid (2012) examined the connection between oral interpretation of literature events and their role in exemplifying performance studies literature, this article continues to connect our forensic events within the larger bodies of communication scholarship. Therefore, the goal of this article is to articulate opportunities to make the connection between communication research and the coaching of communication an explicit activity to help the forensic student understand the forms and function of humor in public speaking.

ADS in Individual Events Research

Scholarly analyses of ADS largely focus on the history of the event, conceptual issues regarding event description, judging paradigms, and persuasive practice. The tradition of competitive after-dinner speaking traces its roots to 1931 when the Intercollegiate Forensic Association of Oregon sponsored the contest at its state tournament (Mahaffey, 1940). In 1937, a Linfield College tournament held its after-dinner rounds during the dinner break of the tournament to give students experience with this difficult, yet commonplace, speaking experience (Mahaffey, 1940). Then in 1973, nearly forty years later, ADS became a nationally recognized event when it was added to the National Forensic Association's (NFA) national tournament. ADS was added under the justification of creating an event that incorporated the use of humor in speech communication research while creating "an extension of what is taught in the classroom" (Mills, 1984, p. 11). Since then, various national organizations have incorporated the event into tournaments with similar, yet distinct, event descriptions. For example, NFA defines the purpose of ADS as "a speech designed to entertain by advancing a relevant point through the use of humor" (NFA, 2014). According to NFA, after-dinner speaking is characterized by "humorous content development, creativity, uniqueness, timeliness, clear organization, significance, credible sources, and vocal and nonverbal delivery choice that reflect the speech's purpose" (NFA, 2014). Meanwhile, the American Forensic Association (AFA) describes after-dinner speaking as "an original, humorous speech by the student, designed to exhibit sound speech composition, thematic coherence, direct communicative public speaking skills, and good taste" (AFA, 2013). In essence, these definitions suggest the purpose of the event is to evidence effective public speaking ability, good taste, and the ability to make a serious, yet entertaining, point through the enactment of humor.

Further, the AFA event description explicitly discourages speeches that resemble nightclub acts, impersonations, or comedic dialogues. This discouragement potentially encourages students to ignore the contributions of comedic writers and performers who adeptly confront serious societal issues through expert deployment of humor. Stand-up performers like Lenny Bruce and George Carlin confronted larger social issues of censorship through their craft, and in so doing enabled larger conversations about the utility of social practice, a goal worthy of any ADS performer. Yet, directing performers to avoid nightclub-esque performances is better interpreted as directing students to endow their messages with implications of meatiness and gravitas. While these definitions offer a starting point for beginning public speakers, they also raise larger questions as to

precisely how one engages serious argument through humor, and how one determines the supposed elements of good taste. As national trends and mythical norms of forensic practice elide towards comedy appealing to the lowest common denominator, there is a need to distinguish ethical uses of humor throughout our rules and expressed pedagogy, as well as our practices. These questions and others are best answered through the literature of communication and humor.

Outside of definitional concerns, ADS research examines competitive standards and implementation. Billings' (1997) survey research revealed 35% of coaches and judges felt humor serves an integral part of the speech. Likewise, Holm (2001) conducted a survey of forensic judges and coaches to determine what audiences look for in an after-dinner speech. Holm concluded the top criteria for ADS were structure, organization, delivery, and, most notably, use of humor. In terms of speech content, Billings (2003) analyzed potentially offensive humor to develop specific humor categories in ADS. Using survey research of 71 judges and coaches, Billings determined the respondents deemed identity-based humor (racist, sexist, homophobic) to be the most offensive and intolerable. According to the same study, the types of humor deemed more acceptable included age, forensic, and political humor, though there are some differences in what audiences find offensive versus tolerable. In terms of competitive paradigms, Billings (1997) argued for the use of judging criterion in assessing after-dinner speeches and suggested, "ADS speaking criteria and formula have become hopelessly mixed" (p. 40), thus causing confusion and a perceived lack of creativity. In the same manner, Richardson (1999) wrote that despite the creative potential of after-dinner speaking, current conventions in the event, such as "narrow paradigms and paint-by-number, cookie cutter approaches reward imitation over imagination" (p. 1). While competition becomes stagnant, the activity gains traction through injecting new ideas from communication research.

Forensic research attempts to address the larger conceptual issues of ADS, as well as to utilize theory to establish boundaries between after-dinner and other public-address events. Dreibelbis and Redmon (1987) attempted to provide recommendations for the organization, style, and "treatment of the serious point" (pg. 96). Through advising students to humorously exaggerate examples to create a sense of affect, Dreibelbis and Redmon recommended students "make a point by changing attitudes or behavior" and "treat the event as a humorous persuasive event" (1987, p. 97). Similarly, Preston (1997) elaborated conceptual issues with ADS related to the operational practice of using humor to make a serious point. Preston (1997) applied Fisher's narrative theory to differentiate ADS from persuasive or informative genres of speaking. In addition to differentiating the event, other scholars attempt to address the effective use of humor in making a serious point. Lawless (2011) proposed the following goals and objectives for the competitive event:

1. Students should be able to understand and effectively use humor as a vehicle of persuasion.
2. Students should learn and be able to use a variety of different types of humor.
3. Students should be able to use humor extemporaneously.
4. Students should demonstrate the ability to create a coherent argument/thesis. (p. 169)

These goals and objectives, while certainly not exhaustive, engage the event's unique

ability to mobilize humor to strengthen argumentation and provide a springboard for the following synthesis of humor theories. Though these studies make important contributions to the body of forensic research, scholarly treatment of ADS has yet to properly position the event within the larger body of research related to the theories and practices of humor in communication. This essay is an attempt to facilitate that connection.

LITERATURE REVIEW

While rhetorical scholarship has tried to determine the persuasive nature of humor, empirical data offers limited conclusion as to how humor in a speech enhances the effectiveness of persuasion. Gruner's (1985) tips for the speaker on using humor synthesized empirical studies on humor in public address to conclude that "a modicum of apt, relevant humor" produces favorable reaction from audiences (p. 142). For example, Chang and Gruner (1981) conducted survey research following informative and persuasive speech examples and found the use of humor enhanced speaking credibility. Humor has also been shown to increase audience interest in perceivably dull speeches; however, speeches that already include elements of interest to an audience have an unrelated effect on audience enjoyment (Gruner, 1970). Yet, early social scientific explorations of humor and persuasion often failed to report statistically significant effects (Markiewicz, 1974). While empirical research struggles to reach a conclusion, theories of humor offer useful conclusions for application to forensic practice, and advancing forensic research. Whether one signifies the pedagogical and competitive purpose of ADS as the ability to either "use humor as a vehicle of persuasion" (Lawless, 2011, p. 169) or "make a serious point through the use of humor" (Dreibelbis & Redmon, 1987, p. 95), both classical and contemporary communication theory offers theoretical advice to the student and instructor.

Classical Theories of Humor

Classical rhetorical scholarship, from which we get our forensic tradition as well as our name, provides a conceptual framework for understanding how one makes a serious point through humor. Aristotle addresses humor in the *Rhetoric* through his discussion of witticisms as a potentially dangerous subject. Aristotle affirms the rhetorical power of using humor as a persuasive device so as to "spoil an opponent's seriousness with laughter and his laughter with seriousness" (trans. 1994, III.18.1419b). In this sense, clever humor can promote persuasion through enactment of unforeseen comparison. Witticisms can destroy an opponent's argument, as long as the joke is worthy of a free man and not "buffoonery" (Aristotle, trans. 1994, *Rhetoric,* III.18.1419b). For Aristotle, humor provides the opportunity to draw attention to social failings or the judgment of character without ignoring his youthful audience's need for entertainment in speech. Applying Aristotle's suggestions to modern forensic practice encourages a forensic student to examine the counter argument to their speech's position and generate humor from the foundation of weakening the opposing side. For example, speakers can make comparisons between the status quo or the opposing position, and establish connotations of poor character to relevant elements of youth culture. Thus, a speech that likens a

counter-argument to an established condition of poor judgment, like Miley Cyrus twerking on the MTV music awards, provides an example of how to undercut opposing arguments through humor.

In his translation of Aristotle's long lost treatise on comedy, Janko (2002) summarizes Aristotle's position that humor derives from either speech or action. Aristotle offers speakers a list of tactics to incorporate into an after-dinner speech as a means of inciting humor. These include homonymy ("when the same word has two or more different meanings," qtd. in Janko, 2002, p. 94), synonyms, repetition, paronyms ("when an extraneous element is attached to the standard term, or by subtraction," p. 94), parody, and the manner of speaking. Similarly, Quintilian's *Institutio* treated humor as an opportunity for "new rhetoric" by allowing the rhetor to deceive the audience through ambiguity, presupposition, and irony without losing character (qtd. in Graban, 2008, p. 40). Hence, Aristotle and Quintilian provide a list of easily adopted linguistic practices to allow the forensic student to learn the craft of persuasive humor.

Cicero as ADS Handbook

Perhaps the most substantial treatment of humor as persuasive argument in classical rhetorical theory comes from the Roman, Cicero. Cicero's *De Oratore* (trans. 1970) argues against the belief that humor could not be taught, a fight contemporary forensic practitioners will find consistent with their experience. Within his treatise, Cicero primarily uses the voice of Caesar to provide a discussion of wit and humor. He explains humor serves a function in rhetorical argument, describing the practices as "pleasant and often tremendously useful to employ humor and witticisms" (Cicero, trans. 1970, II.247). While wit may be seen as a useful tool, it is not to be used without purpose, for that will earn the speaker the title of "buffoon" (Cicero, trans. 1970, II.247). Cicero attests orators use humorous language "for a specific reason, that is not to seem funny, but to achieve something, while buffoons go on all day without any reason at all" (trans. 1970, II.247). Similarly, the forensic event of after-dinner speaking is congruent with Cicero as considerable effort is made to ensure students avoid speeches that resemble a night club act. The norms of forensic performance encourage students to use humor to advance the argument and judges frequently criticize a student appearing to use non-topical humor. Cicero's account teaches us that a well-constructed humorous speech must begin with a clearly defined purpose that can be found within the rhetorical tradition of informing, praising, or persuading.

Further, Cicero recognizes the effect of humor on audiences and judges. Cicero observes that "cheerfulness by itself wins goodwill for the one who has excited it; or because everyone admires cleverness," thereby indicating that humor generates positive rapport between a speaker and an audience (trans. 1970, II. 236). This passage suggests the speaker utilizes humor and proof of his cleverness to win over the audience. Cicero offers an additional purpose for the inclusion of humor in oratory, by claiming, "when someone is more elegantly witty than anyone else" this person is "seen to have more authority and dignity than anyone else," suggesting that humor adds additional credibility to the speaker (trans. 1970, II.228). This purpose is applicable to forensics in that an unwritten judging criterion for ADS involves "who was funnier" (Olson, 1989, p. 435). Cicero expounds on the choice of topic that a speaker employing humor should use, asserting "each and every commonplace that I may touch upon as a source for the

humorous can generally speaking serve as a source for serious thoughts" (trans. 1970, II.248). This precept, that the best source for humorous topics should be serious topics provides a tangible connection to the modern speaker. As NFA's event description indicates, the better topics in after-dinner are ones that provide some social significance which would otherwise evoke serious thought, yet is arrived at through the use of humor. Finally, Cicero advocates the best sources of humor and wit are those topics of universal feeling that relate to the audience but does not offend them (trans. 1970, II.236). ADS competitors can take away from Cicero that the best sources of topics have serious connections to everyone. Cicero's point has contemporary applications to competition as forensic judges are known to continuously search for the student to "make a serious point in a humorous way" (Olson, 1989, p. 435).

Though Cicero provides useful precepts for the purpose and topic of humorous argumentation, his guidance for constructing humor is the most applicable for forensic speakers. Cicero lays out two types of witticism: one that is spread evenly through the whole discourse, called banter, and another that is pointed and concise, called sharp-wittedness. He states strategic use of both humor types is required for effective humor. This is reflected in the conventions of after-dinner speeches as speakers employ ongoing jokes which continually build upon the humor, colloquially known as a vehicle, and pointed punch lines that typically fall at the end of each argument. Cicero developed a rhetorical system for the purpose of creating laughter to advance forensic speech:

> For laughter is provoked by deceiving people's expectations, by mocking other people's character, or giving a hint of our own, by comparison to something worse, by irony, by saying slightly absurd things, and by censuring stupidity. Accordingly, anyone who wants to speak with humor must be permeated, so to speak, to nurture a character that is suited to these types, so that his facial expression can also be adapted to each type of humor. (trans. 1970, II.289-290)

Cicero's account of how laughter is provoked provides a useful framework for the creation of humor for the purpose of ADS in terms of content. Initially, Cicero explains laughter involves deceiving people's expectations, and encourages the most effective form of joke is the "unexpected turn," suggesting laughter occurs when we "expect to hear one thing but another is said" (trans. 1970, II.28). This position provides meaningful advice to the forensic speaker who creates a sentence structure that encourages the audience to rely on familiar phrases so the speaker can then turn it around for the purpose of creating a joke. Take for example the statement: "We must question the value of our jokes. For instance, my jokes are priceless, because no one will buy them."[3] This creates an unexpected turn, as it takes the meaning of priceless as above value and turns it to mean the opposite.

Cicero's notion of irony is also relevant to the construction of humorous speeches. While modern use of irony distorts the original meaning, Cicero confirms irony is "saying something different from what you think" (trans. 1970, II.269). Likewise, after-dinner speeches should employ rigorous use of irony in the hopes of creating moments of laughter. Cicero encourages the use of what the Greeks called "paranomaia," in which a slight alteration of a word or letter within a common phrase helps incite laughter (trans. 1970, II. 256). Further, censuring stupidity becomes a useful technique in the application

---

[3] The author would like to acknowledge Patrick Campbell for his suggestion of this joke for inclusion in this text.

of joke construction. The ADS speechwriter should seek out areas of his or her topic that displays a nonsensical thought or an idea containing limited amounts of intelligence. This provides the speaker with an ability to persuade through drawing attention to an inconsistency, which Cicero cites as a cause of laughter.

In addition, Cicero's position on what should constitute a joke emphasizes topical humor that results from the content of the speech. He encourages that a joke should be based on content as "it remains witty no matter what words you use to express it; one that loses its bite when the words are changed owes all of its humor to the words" (trans. 1970, II.259). His advice speaks to a common problem within Roman oratory of speakers attempting to encourage laughter by using non-topical forms of humor, an issue routinely felt in modern forensics. To the forensic student, this advice should instill a sense of searching for the most effective content on which to create the jokes. A reliance solely on simple one-liners and funny phrases will not, according to Cicero, amount to much. By pointing to theoretical models from Roman antiquity, coaches can encourage students to avoid the creation of humor that is absurd, such as the wearing of silly costumes, use of unrelated visual aids, or speaking in a silly tone of voice. Convincing students to stray from this type of humor proves difficult when students can point to competitively successful speeches involving stick ponies, watermelons, and other examples of rewarding behaviors scholarship says to avoid. However, through an understanding of Cicero, coaches are armed with the knowledge that while these behaviors may cause initial laughter, "we also laugh at the clown" (Cicero, trans. 1970, II.259). We are unlikely to seek the counsel of a clown for societal issues, nor are we to follow their lead in the direction of social change. Additionally, the last profession a public speaker should be associated with is a clown.

Moreover, Cicero's "Excursus on Wit" provides a guide for the appropriateness of after-dinner speeches (trans. 1970, II.225). Cicero implores remaining appropriate is vital to effective humor. He advocates speakers "take into account the people, the cause, and the circumstances so that our joking does not detract from our authority" (trans. 1970, II.221). ADS speakers, however, frequently make use of "blue" and inappropriate humor hoping to enact laughter through shock. A common practice within the event is to rely on "too soon" jokes, in which seemingly off limit ideas such as a celebrity death, national tragedy, or disease becomes the point of the humor. Cicero advises against this tactic, warning "that is in fact the most difficult thing for humorous sharp-witted people to do: to take account of people and circumstances, and to refrain from saying what occurs to them even if it would be extremely funny to make the remark" (trans. 1970, II.221). Cicero's position encourages speakers to approach humor with temperance, as a remark that seems to shock the audience will, in fact, damage their opinion of the speaker as witty. He holds the best forms of humor do not mock those who are held in high esteem with the public; otherwise the audience may turn against the speaker.

Modern forensic students should take heed of this notion and beware that "the audience wants villains to be wounded by a weapon more forceful than humor, and do not want the miserable to be mocked" (Cicero, trans. 1970, II.237). As such, an effective ADS will avoid using humor to vilify an individual with little social recourse and should certainly cease any jokes about subjects the audience associates with pity as a material for humor. This is corroborated by Billings' (2003) findings that ADS humor typically labeled offensive are often related to marginalized groups. While this practice may

produce laughter from an audience, Cicero holds they will still view the act as "buffoonish" (trans. 1970, II.246). Current forensics rules and regulations hint at this in stating students use good taste; however, it should largely remain the job of the student to ensure his or her humor is fitting to the case and audience at hand. Incorporating this interpretation of Cicero into forensic instruction allows coaches to point to thousands of years of evidence as proof off-color jokes can potentially damage their credibility. This loss of ethos by the speaker is almost impossible to retain once lost in the course of a ten-minute oration.

While Cicero's treatise provides insight for the forensic competitor in regards to the purpose, topic, and construction of humor, Cicero's work provides understanding of what many believe to be a modern innovation. He affirms the practice of "calling out" other competitors, or what Billings (1997) refers to as "spontaneous jokes," as an inventional tool (p. 45). A common practice in ADS national final rounds involves using the topics or speeches of the previous competitors to make a joke that downplays their speech, more commonly referred to as "calling out" another competitor. This practice was apparently also commonplace in the forensic speeches of the classical era. Cicero does not deny this practice is effective, claiming "it is neat when the one who has made a joke is mocked by the same kind of joke that he made" (trans. 1970, II.277). However, he cautions the speaker to poke fun at the fellow competitor's case, or his argument, rather than resorting to "stinging insults" that make fun of the opponent himself. In this regard, Cicero's guidance can be interpreted to mean the speaker should analyze the argument the competitor attempts to make and use humor derived from that specific argument. The laughter that derives from this action will, in Cicero's eyes, win the round. He describes the use of this type of humor in competitive orations in the following excerpt:

> Laughter crushes the opponent, obstructs him, makes light of him; or because it shows the orator himself to be refined, to be educated, to be well bred; and especially because it soothes and relaxes sternness and severity and, often by joking and laughter, dismisses offensive remarks that are not easily refuted by arguments. (Cicero, trans. 1970, II.236)

Cicero explains creating a point of laughter creates an advantageous position for the ADS speaker. Cicero's approximation is correct, as the moments most remembered from final rounds are often the improvised remarks. These remarks invoke the topics and arguments of the competition and generally allow the audience to feel the speaker dominated the round.

Contemporary Theories of Humor

While classical rhetorical theory offers templates for the instruction of ADS, contemporary scholarship builds from psychology, classics, and philosophy to provide a workable body of research relating to both the theory and production of humor. Understanding the development of humor as explored in a variety of disciplines arms the student and educator of after-dinner speaking with a wealth of knowledge for use in speech construction. Despite their disciplinary origins, cross-applying contemporary theories of humor with the practice of communication enables the student to adequately address what a particular audience may find funny. Therefore the remainder of the essay

examines the following theories of humor and their application to the construction of ADS: superiority, relief, incongruity, and affective absurdity.

Humor as Superiority

Superiority theory proposes humor is inextricably linked with cultural position of dominance over others (Gruner, 1997; Rapp, 1951). Superiority theory was originally developed from the philosophy of Hobbes (1996 [1651]) who posited that people please themselves through gaining enjoyment of those beneath them. Morreall's (1982) seminal study and theorization of laughter engages Hobbes' notion of the subject of humor and suggests "the oldest and still the most widespread theory of laughter is that laughter is an expression of a person's feeling of superiority over others" (p. 243). Citing the philosophy of Plato, Voltaire and Hobbes, Meyer (2000) asserts people laugh at others to "feel some sort of triumph over them" (p. 314). The concept of superiority affirms humor results from "seeing one's self as superior, right or triumphant in contrast to one who is inferior" (Meyer, 2000, p. 315). Jesting or joking provides a "powerful strategy for communication across social difference" (Holcomb, 2001, p. 2). Drawing from the philosophy of Bakhtin (1984), Holcomb (2001) affirms humor allows the speaker to gain control of an audience, thereby unleashing social forces beyond traditional forms of control. He asserts jesting "confers power on the speaker and increases their ability to manage diverse social situations"; however, this affective form of power comes with a price, as speakers must subjugate themselves to their audience (p. 26).

The theory of superiority offers a troubling position for the forensic speaker, as students must be careful to create humor that allows the audience to feel superior over the oppositional argument as opposed to constructing humor that affirms dominant ideology. However, superiority theory also indicates the power of those in lower social position to generate humor through prevailing over those in higher social positions. While superiority theory indicates humor as a means of correcting social behaviors, Meyer (2000) elaborates there is a subversive component to superiority theory that enables the speaker to see themselves as triumphant over one who is wrong. For example, a speaker from a socially marginalized group may employ humor that illustrates the fallacies of a hegemonic culture. This could be achieved by a student of color pointing out the incongruities of racial privilege, or through a female speaker poking fun at the heterosexist assumptions of her higher pitched speaking voice. Holcomb's (2001) notion of humor and jesting as a form of unleashing social forces provides a justification for the common convention of addressing societal issues or value-based topics in ADS. For example, previous national final round topics have included arguments for the rights and experience of transpersons, as well as consciousness-raising for able-bodied privilege. By engaging these societal issues through the safety of ADS, the forensic student embarks on a particularly liberating journey of social change all through the action of humor.

Humor as Relief

Building from psychology and psychoanalysis, scholars suggest humor functions as relief in the reduction of stress (Berlyne, 1972; Morreall, 1982; Raskin, 1985; Shurcliff, 1968). Meyer (2000) offers humor results "from the relief experienced when tensions are engendered and removed from an individual" (p. 312). Therefore, humor essentially results from the creation or tension and resolution of cognitive dissonance. Relief theory

builds from the perspective of Freud (1960) who suggests we laugh as a means of releasing subconscious desires. Lynch (2002) posits humor as relief comes from reducing tension and providing liberation from the posture of normative practice. In his overview of theoretical constructs, Meyer (2000) reports studies of humor emphasize rhetorical exigency and makes "the situation seem more elastic, or more manageable, by showing that difficulties are not so overwhelming as to be out of control after all" (p. 312). Therefore, relief humor offers insight into ADS through establishing tension surrounding a social idea or problem. This tension is managed by the speaker and ultimately relieved through humor. Therefore when the speaker provides an opportune element of humor the audience is able to establish resonance with the topic, engage its tensions, and ultimately feel the relief when the speaker ruptures the tension. Through this cycle of tension and relief audiences come to identify with the speaker and their topic in meaningful ways. By creating identification with their audience ADS speakers can also use relief humor to encourage the audience to feel personally connected with forms of solvency.

Humor as Incongruity

Perhaps the most broadly embraced theory of humor posits humor results from incongruous interpretations (Berger, 1976; Deckers & Devine, 1981; Meyer, 2000). Meyer (2000) observes, "people laugh at what surprises them, is unexpected, or is odd in a nonthreatening way" (p. 313). In this, surprise is a key element of humor as audiences must be able to have some expectation violated for humor to occur. Lynch's (2002) review of incongruity theory noted the ambiguity of humor is important "for understanding the use of humor in social organizations and as a communication phenomenon" (p. 429). In this sense, incongruity motivates an understanding of the "duality or the paradox of humor" (Lynch, 2002, p. 433). Exposing incongruous relationships in society allows humor to function as a persuasive output of resistance (Greenbaum, 1999). In her ethnography of stand-up comedy, Greenbaum (1999) found humor builds identification with the speaker's world-view and thus "persuades audience members to adopt particular ideologies" (p. 33). Hence, from a functionary standpoint, incongruity theory highlights normative evaluations of society an effective speaker can utilize to prove a point.

Incongruity theory also is useful to the forensic speaker in understanding how one is to prove a serious point through humor. Too often after-dinner speeches rely on adjacent humor not related to the topic at hand. For example, students are prone to the practice of constructing the argument for their speech and then inserting "jokes" after the fact. These so-called jokes often take the form of similes that, like Ke$ha's fashion sense, is surprising but not necessarily humorous. Perhaps upon reading this last sentence a reader might give pause or chuckle; however, the reader might then ask what the pop musician Ke$ha has to do with theories of humor. Hence, interjecting jokes into a rhetorical argument will not necessarily prove an argument, enhance a point, or produce humor. Instead, incongruity theory proposes the ADS speaker utilize ambiguity, paradox, and dissonance to persuade an audience to adopt the ideology being advocated within the speech.

Humor as Affective Absurdity

Veatch (1998) attempts to construct a post-positivist theory of humor that defines,

measures and predicts humor as an outcome variable. Echoing incongruity theory, Veatch proposes humor arrives from a dialectical tension of things perceived as normal and, at the same time, having a strong affective response of what is being violated. While not considered a major theory of humor, Veatch's (1998) Affective Absurdity Theory (AAT) provides an accessible and clear model for humor production that is useful in the education of ADS speakers.[4] In short, Veatch's theory of affective absurdity declares "humor occurs when it seems that things are normal, while at the same time something seems wrong. Or in an openly apparent paradox, humor is emotional pain that does not hurt" (1998, p. 164). This theory is based upon three necessary conditions for humor that, if present in the individual's mind, will indicate a humorous situation: violation, normalcy, and simultaneity. First, in order for someone to find something funny they must have some cognitive perception of the situation as normal. Second, the perceived normal situation is violated in a simultaneous process that produces the feeling of humor. Third, this violation occurs through "simultaneity" in which the violation of the perceived norm is instantly confronted with emotional attachment to the norm being violated (p.164).

   Veatch's (1998) emphasis on subjective moral violation provides insight into the types of humor that produce a positive response; it helps us determine what an audience might perceive as funny. According to Veatch, what we find funny is largely dependent on our subjective moral values—we are not likely to laugh at violations of principles we hold dear. Affective absurdity theory predicts when two individuals are exposed to the same communicative act, and one finds the situation funny and the other finds it offensive, the offended individual will have a stronger attachment to the normative principle being violated. Likewise, the individual who found the communicative act to be funny must have some attachment to the normative principle that outweighs the attachment being violated. Veatch (1998) posits "the more moral a person is, the more serious their attachment to moral principles, and the less those attachments can be broken through humorous interpretations" (p. 172). Where there is an inverse relationship between normalcy and violation interpretation, Veatch points out "even something quite offensive or threatening can be made to seem funny if, for example, a joke is told by someone felt to be safe" (1998, p. 178).

   Affective Absurdity Theory (AAT), as proposed by Veatch (1998), offers insights into the construction of ADS and the attempt to prove a serious point through humor. First, the theory connects the practice of building ADS speeches around value and sociocultural topics. Applying AAT affirms humor helps to highlight normative convention, thus allowing for social critique. Take, for example, a 2008 NFA championship after-dinner on "How to Date a Fat Girl." While on the surface the informative nature of this example seems to detract from an emphasis on proving a serious point through humor, the overall topic can be said to address a larger societal issue through the organizational pattern of a how to speech. As body image is not a principle most audiences have strong moral connections to, yet there is a strong normative principle being violated, the humor proved successful in achieving its effect. The humor used throughout this speech highlighted the normative abjection of the female

---

[4] For more information on other theories related to humor production see Gruner's (1997) Games Theory, as well as derivatives of Veatch's Benign Violation Theory (McGraw & Warren, 2010; McGraw, Warren, Williams, & Leonard, 2012).

form by creating humor exposing the audience's normative conceptualizations of romanticizing ideal body types. In directing attention to her figure, the speaker in this example is able to argue for societal change through humor by first capitalizing on the audience's normative expectations of full-figured women, and then violating that norm by explicitly discussing the values of these women in romantic situations. Further through exposing the audience's violation of bodily norms in the first place, the speaker in this example is able to simultaneously generate a reflexive awareness in her audience of their own biases and normative constructions. Thus, the speaker capably generates productive social critique through humorous exchange.

Further, the relationship between normative violation principles also offers explanatory mechanisms for how some performers are able to get away with certain types of humor when others are not. For instance, the preceding example of "How to Date a Fat Girl" is predicated on the relationship between the speaker and the subject matter; the speaker provides agency for the audience to accept the violation. Application of AAT to ADS encourages students to search for normative violations through their individual experience, thus creating safe spaces for students to engage their lived experiences while at the same time combating societal norms through humor. AAT posits that after-dinner students should avoid humor predicated on violating norms outside their individual experience. In addition, AAT also serves as a reminder to the forensic student that successful humor must be relatable and address some normative principle. This idea is in opposition to a student wishing to advance absurdist humor and the post-structuralist form of joke construction, as an audience must be able to comprehend the normalcy being violated in order to laugh.

Conclusions and Directions for Future Research

It turns out academic treatment of humor isn't all that funny. This article provides tentative and tangible connections of forensic practice to the larger theoretical body of literature on humor and public speech. The classical theories of rhetoric offered by Cicero, Quintilian, and Aristotle indicate the art of using humor to advance argument is an ancient practice harkening back to the days of the first forensic speeches. The theories of Superiority, Relief, Incongruity, and Affective Absurdity also enhance our understanding of forensic practice and improve the pursuit of creating humorous argument.

Circulating this body of research and its application to forensic events makes an important contribution to the field of forensic research by articulating why choices made by coaches and students in ADS are ineffective. Too often forensic educators attempt to circumvent communication research and justify the use of techniques on the auspice of adhering to supposedly unwritten rules, or norms, of forensics. While these unwritten rules provide some educational advantages in helping students construct events (Paine, 2005), they also carry the potential to stifle creativity through an emphasis on established competitive conventions (Gaer, 2002). In reality, competitive conventions and unwritten rules can be cogently explained through a brief nod and understanding to communication and humor theory. If forensics practitioners expose students to this literature throughout the process of speech construction, we can better direct a student's choices and offer tangible introductions to the discipline of communication and the value of research. This

alone broadens the academic impact of forensics in the field and can draw better connections between research and forensic educators within academic departments.

When a student asks *why* we do what we do, it has never been sufficient to answer, "That's just how it works." As members of the forensic community, and stewards to the power of speech, we must challenge ourselves to make the connection between theory, research, and competition a clear and explicit component of our activity. Conversely, forensics can serve an epistemological function to this literature as forensics researchers and students can directly test the functionality of these theories in practice and help to negate theoretical suppositions and broaden humor constructs.

Forensics could study the validity of Affective Absurdity Theory by studying ADS humor that bombs. Forensics offers a readily available sample of students who regularly experience the failures of humor. For example, scholars could design a scale to measure the impact and effectiveness of student's humor construction. This scale could be mobilized through a survey circulated to current and former forensic competitors. To avoid research dependent on recall of particular humor, a survey could be distributed immediately as individuals exit out-round performances of ADS at a variety of tournaments and ask students to evaluate the use of humor in real time. This survey could include scales and measures designed to correlate the normative and violation principles of AAT within the forensic environment. Qualitatively, scholars could generate open-ended surveys and in-depth interviews with current and former forensic competitors asking them to describe humor they performed that did not meet the desired expectation. Moreover, as forensics increasingly becomes a digital endeavor, scholars could solicit students for textual examples of what they felt was the least effective use of humor. These examples could be coded, and using a grounded theoretical approach, produce exploratory frameworks for emerging themes of failed humor construction.

Moreover, the recordings of national final rounds offer potential use in research design. Researchers could design experiments to see if the humor within the forensic community is seen as successful to those outside its boundaries. National final round speeches could be shown to a randomly selected sample of participants who would then fill out a survey to assess their individual receptions of humor, as well as the effectiveness of the speeches at achieving a serious argument. These brief discussions of research pragmatics could have the added benefit of arming students with knowledge that extend beyond forensic eligibility. As students continue to place their forensic accomplishments on resumes and vitae, it is important they become fluent in the research and theory that coincides with their practice.

This essay testifies that while the activity may be a living laboratory for research, it must also be a living classroom for theory. Forensics is already an advanced course in self-confidence, performance, research skills, and small group communication. Likewise, by encouraging students to understand why the events function the way they do by developing a more thorough knowledge of scholarship, we can acculturate a new generation of scholars into the power and applicability of theory and research. To the degree to which forensics educators tangibly connect forensics to other areas of the disciplinary research, they can begin to build a case for stronger institutional and departmental support. Thus, through the engagement of communication theory in ADS, scholars, coaches, and students can strive to ensure the only time people laugh at forensics is in a round.

REFERENCES

American Forensic Association, Description of Individual Events (2013). *American Forensic Association National Individual Events Tournament.* Retrieved from: http://www.mnsu.edu/cmst/niet/eventdescriptions-new09-10.html

Aristotle. (1994). *On rhetoric.* (G. Kennedy, Trans.). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Bakhtin, M. (1984). Rabelais and his world. (H. Iswolsky, Trans.). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Berger, A. A. (1976). Anatomy of the joke. *Journal of Communication*, *26*(3), 113-115.

Berlyne, D. E. (1972). Humor and its kin. In J. H. Goldstein & P. E. McGhee (Eds.), *The psychology of humor* (pp. 43-60). New York, NY: Academic Press.

Billings, A. C. (1997). When criteria becomes formula: The search for standardization within competitive after-dinner speeches. *National Forensic Journal*, *15*, 39-50.

Billings, A.C. (2003). Offending none, entertaining none: Acceptable humor in after-dinner speaking. *National Forensic Journal*, *21*(1), 2-11.

Burnett, A., Brand, J., & Meister, M. (2003). Winning is everything: Education as myth in forensics. *National Forensic Journal, 21*(1), 2-11.

Chang, M. J., & Gruner, C. R. (1981). Audience reaction to self-disparaging humor. *Southern Journal of Communication*, *46*(4), 419-426.

Cicero. (trans.1970). *De oratore.* (J.S. Watson, Trans.) Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Croucher, S. (2006). Special issue editor's introduction: Communication theory and intercollegiate forensics–addressing the research void within forensic. *National Forensic Journal*, *24*(2), 1-6.

Deckers, L., & Devine, J. (1981). Humor by violating an existing expectancy. *The Journal of Psychology*, *108*(1), 107-110.

Dreibelbis, G., & Redmon, K. (1987). But seriously folks... suggestions and considerations for writing the competitive after-dinner speech. *National Forensic Journal*, *5*, 78-95.

Freud, S. (1960). *Jokes and their relation to the unconscious.* New York, NY: Norton.

Gaer, D. (2002). Formulaic forensic: When competitive success stifles creativity. *National Forensic Journal, 20,* 54-56.

Germeroth, K. S. D. (1998). Should we laugh or should we cry? John Callahan's humor as a tool to change societal attitudes toward disability. *Howard Journal of Communication*, *9*(3), 229-244.

Gill, M. (1990). Why coaches quit: A replication and extension. *National Forensic Journal, 10*, 47-51

Graban, T. S. (2008). Beyond "wit and persuasion": Rhetoric, composition, and humor studies. In V. Rashkin (Ed.), *The primer of humor research* (pp. 399-449). New York, NY: Mouton de Gruyte.

Greenbaum, A. (1999). Stand-up comedy as rhetorical argument: An investigation of comic culture. *Humor*, *12*(1), 33-46.

Gruner, C. R. (1967). Effects of humor on speaker ethos and audience information. *Journal of Communication*, *17*(3), 228-233.

Gruner, C.R. (1970). The effect of humor on dull and interesting informative speeches. *Central States Speech Journal, 21,* 160-166.

Gruner, C.R. (1985). Advice to the beginning speaker on using humor- what the research tells us. *Communication Education, 34*(2), 142-147.

Gruner, C.R. (1997) *The game of humor: A comprehensive theory of why we laugh.* New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.

Hobbes, T. (1996). *Leviathan.* New York: Oxford University Press [Originally published 1651].

Holcomb, C. (2001). *Mirth making: The rhetorical discourse on jesting in early modern England*. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press.

Holm, T. T. (2001). On the early education of the after-dinner speaking god. *Collegiate Forensics Association Journal*, *2*(1), 1-26.

Holm, T. T. (1994). Finding time for forensics: A time management idea for forensics programs. *Speaker Points*, *1*(2),

Janko, R., (2002). *Aristotle on comedy: Towards a reconstruction of Poetics II*. London: Duckworth.

Kay, J. (1992). Gridiron nights, comedy clubs, and after-dinner speaking: Prescriptions from real world analogues. *Argumentation and Advocacy*, *28*(4), 168-77.

Kerber, A. G., & Cronn-Mills, D. (2005). The state of forensic scholarship: Analyzing individual events research in the National Forensic Journal from 1990-2003. *National Forensic Journal*, *23*(2), 69-82.

Kozbelt, A., & Nishioka, K. (2010). Humor comprehension, humor production, and insight: An exploratory study. *International Journal of Humor Research*, *23*(3), 375-401.

Lawless, B. (2011). After-dinner speaking: Problems, causes, and still no solutions. *National Forensic Journal*, *29*(2), 161-173.

Lynch, O. H. (2002). Humorous communication: Finding a place for humor in communication research. *Communication Theory*, *12*(4), 423-445.

Mahaffey, R. D. (1940). After-dinner speaking. *Western Speech*, *5*(1), 10-13.

Markiewicz, D. (1974). Effects of humor on persuasion. *Sociometry*, *37*(3), 407-422.

McGraw, A. P., & Warren, C. (2010). Benign violations making immoral behavior funny. *Psychological Science*, *21*(8), 1141-1149.

McGraw, A. P., Warren, C., Williams, L. E., & Leonard, B. (2012). Too close for comfort, or too far to care? Finding humor in distant tragedies and close mishaps. *Psychological Science*, *23*(10), 1215-1223.

Meyer, J. C. (2000). Humor as a double-edged sword: Four functions of humor in communication. *Communication Theory*, *10*(3), 310-331.

Mills, N.H. (1984). Judging the after-dinner speaking competitor: Style and content. *National Forensic Journal, 2*(1), 11-18.

Morreall, J. (1982). A new theory of laughter. *Philosophical Studies*, *42*(2), 243-254.

Morreall, J. (Ed.). (1987). *The philosophy of laughter and humor.* Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

National Forensic Association, Event Descriptions (2014). *NFA Individual Event Descriptions.* Retrieved from NFA website: https://sites.google.com/site/nationalforensicsassociation/competition/individual-events

Olson, C. D. (1989). The development of evaluation criteria for individual events. *Conference Proceedings – National Communication Association/American Forensic Association (Alta Conference on Argumentation)*, 434-439.

Paine, R. (2005). Identifying and evaluating the "unwritten rules" of competition. *National Forensic Journal,23*(1)*,* 79-88.

Preston, C.T. (1997). Fisher's Narrative Paradigm Theory: A model for differentiating after-dinner speaking from informative and persuasive speaking. *Proceedings on the Third Developmental Conference on Individual Events,* 91-99.

Preston, C.T. (1995). Contributory factors in coach burnout and brain drain in forensics: Some suggestions for credibility and activity survival. *The Forensic of PI KAPPA DELTA, 80*(3), 16-22.

Quintilian. (trans.2001). *Institutio oratoria.* (D. A. Russell, Trans.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Rapp, A. (1951). *The origins of wit and humor.* New York, NY: E.P. Dutton.

Raskin, V. (1985). *Semantic mechanisms of humor.* Boston, MA*:* Reidel.

Raskin, V. (Ed.). (2008). *The primer of humor research*. New York, NY: Mouton de Gruyter.

Reid, A. (2012). Building Bridges: Connecting performance studies to forensic oral interpretation. *National Forensic Journal, 30,* 21-39.

Richardson, R. R. (1999). Problem in after-dinner speaking: Ranting into a new millennium. Paper presented at the National Communication Association convention, Chicago, IL.

Shurcliff, A. (1968). Judged humor, arousal, and the relief theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *8*(4), 360-363.

Smith, C. M., & Powell, L. (1988). The use of disparaging humor by group leaders. *Southern Speech Communication Journal*, *53*(3), 279-292.

Veatch, T. C. (1998). A theory of humor. *Humor: International Journal of Humor Research*, *11*(2), 161-216.

Worth, D. (2002). Increasing forensics research: Recognizing our strengths. *National Forensic Journal*, *20*(1), 66-70.

Adam J. Sharples is a doctoral candidate in the College of Communication and Information Sciences at The University of Alabama. Correspondence to: Adam J. Sharples Department of Communication Studies Box 870172 Tuscaloosa AL, 35487 email: ajsharples@crimson.ua.edu.

Abuse of Evidence in Persuasive Speaking:
An Un-Conventional Solution

Amy Mendes
Berry College

Scholars in the forensics community have been lamenting the misuse and abuse of evidence in forensics competition for decades. Beginning with Frank's 1983 discussion of evidentiary abuse in Persuasive speaking, authors have offered possible solutions to end the problem. However, as the ongoing focus might suggest, these solutions have not had the intended effect. In this paper, we continue the investigation into evidence use in Persuasive speaking by repeating Frank's original study but offer an unusual solution that may finally effectively address the problem.

It has been three decades since Dr. Robert Frank published the findings from his analysis of the 1981 NFA final round of Persuasive Speaking. This study yielded three types of evidentiary misuse: fabrication, distortion and deception (Frank, 1983). It is doubtful the idea that some students, in some rounds, at some tournaments may have "padded" their sources was completely foreign to the forensics community. However, two specific aspects of Frank's findings were particularly troubling: the misuses of data were so numerous within each speech, and this misuse was occurring at the very highest levels of competition. If these competitors were the very best of our students and they were engaging in evidence abuse, then it seemed more than likely that such conduct was common amongst competitors at all levels.

Many scholars within the forensics community have studied the use of evidence in public address (Cronn-Mills & Schnoor, 2003; Del Casale et al., 2003; Frank, 1983; Perry, 2002; Perry 2003; Thomas & Hart, 1983). Over the course of more than three decades of study, a recurring pattern of evidentiary abuse at the highest level of competition has been found. While no longitudinal study has been done to prove how consistent this problem is, and the sample sizes have been very small (usually final rounds of a national tournament) due to practical constraints, there seems to be enough data to merit the questions:

- Is the ethical use of evidence really important to us as a community, and if so,
- How do we go about teaching it/requiring it/rewarding it in a way that is practical and effective?

In order to address these questions, some of the complicated issues that relate directly and indirectly to the question of ethical use of evidence will be considered. The results of the 2011 National Forensic Association final round of Persuasive Speaking will be examined to see if they yield further corroboration of the trend of evidence abuse. Finally, practical and effective means of controlling evidence abuse in competitive persuasive speaking will be suggested.

The debate over whether forensics should be considered an extra- or co-curricular activity seems to be relevant to any discussion of ethical use of evidence in competition. If we acknowledge forensics activity as a part of the college students' overall education, then the responsibility to maintain high academic standards within the activity is undeniable. We would no more allow unethical evidence use or improper source citation in a forensics speech than a college English department would allow it in a composition class. Kelly et al. (2005) explained

the behaviors condoned and encouraged in the laboratory of forensics competition may have implications far beyond that setting. Kerber and Cronn-Mills (2003) pointed to the importance of emphasizing the educational aspects of forensics in order to strengthen the relationship between our pedagogy and our theoretical basis.

However, it has been posed by some that intercollegiate forensics is not by definition educational (Burnett, Brand & Meister, 2003), but rather an extracurricular activity. If this is true, it could be argued that it is unnecessary to apply the same rigorous academic standards as the classroom. However, even if one views forensics activity to be completely extracurricular, and not an extension of academics, there is still an imperative to "play by the rules." Football is not an academic activity, but it has rules of play, and those who do not follow them are penalized. Similarly, both the National Forensic Association (NFA bylaws, 2013) and the American Forensic Association (AFA code, 2014) decry plagiarism, and AFA goes on to give specific and detailed descriptions of how to properly cite evidence in individual events, making clear that the competitive nature of the national tournaments depends somewhat on compliance with these rules. There is also the consideration of the wider social response to plagiarism. Outside of academia, intentional plagiarism may still result in severe sanctions, including loss of employment or legal action. So, regardless of which side of the co-curricular/extra-curricular debate one favors, there are compelling reasons why forensics students should avoid evidentiary abuse. Yet the abuses continue, as is apparent in this most recent analysis.

In this study, the author has replicated Frank's (1983) original study on the 30th anniversary of its publication by analyzing the final round of Persuasive Speaking from the National Forensic Association's National Tournament held in April 2011. Unlike previous authors, who were attempting to verify the existence of misuse of evidence for the purpose of describing and quantifying it, this study seeks rather to determine whether such abuses continue, in order to discuss possible strategies for ending the practice of evidence abuse. In short, this author is interested in determining if the results from the 2011 tournament corroborate the findings of previous research for the purpose of contextualizing a discussion of possible solutions to the problem of evidentiary abuse.

METHOD OF ANALYSIS

The author analyzed transcripts of the speeches, which were produced by students in an introductory level public speaking class by watching the final round recordings available for order from the National Forensic Association. Each speech was independently transcribed by at least three students, and these transcripts were then compared and verified by the author.

The author then tallied and catalogued the factual claims in each speech. Factual claims were defined as any statement containing information, which was beyond the scope of common knowledge, especially those containing references to individuals, locations, publications, legislation or actual events. The total number of factual claims in the 6 speeches was tallied at 117. This author makes no claims with regards to the perfect accuracy of the number of "factual claims," as such a definition is open to interpretation by individual readers. However, the measurement provides a baseline for estimating the scale of the problem of evidence abuse within this particular round of competition.

Factual claims that were accompanied by a source citation were then tallied, and those citations were investigated. The author and several student assistants attempted to locate the sources cited. It was then noted whether the source was locatable with the information given in the speech, and if so, if it contained the information that was being cited by the students.

RESULTS

The results of this study are similar to those found previously. All six of the speakers engaged in

evidence abuse. The total number of claims was 117. The total number of claims in which sources were correctly cited was 31, or 26.5%. The number of claims in which a source is cited, but that source either could not be found or did not contain the data suggested was 45, or 38.5% of the total. And in 41 cases, claims or statements of fact were made for which no citation was given. This made up 35% of the total claims.

This represents an overview of the use of evidence in the rounds. However, breaking the analysis down by speaker reveals an even more troubling story. None of the speeches were free of errors. Each of them contained factual claims for which no source of evidence was given, and each of the speeches contained citations for sources of evidence that could not be verified, either because the original source could not be located at all, or because once located, it did not contain the data that was being used by the speaker. The overall accuracy of the source citations within a particular speech ranged from a high of 76% to an astonishing low of 0%. To be clear, this number represents accuracy of citation and should not be construed to mean an accusation of intentional wrongdoing. The fact that sources cannot be located using the citation given in the speech should not be taken to mean that the source does not or did not exist at all, but it definitely does establish that the student failed to give an effective and accurate citation as required by both AFA and NFA.

IMPLICATIONS

The purpose of this analysis was to establish the existence of evidence abuse within this particular round of competition, not to measure the exact amount or nature of it. The analyses conducted do establish the existence of evidentiary abuse and are therefore useful. While it may be interesting to further analyze the data from these speeches to ascertain if the types or degree of evidence abuse has changed over time, a more pressing concern for this author is how to address this ongoing problem.

It would be difficult, and detrimental to the forensics community, to attempt to point fingers at individual speakers, programs, or coaches with an eye to laying blame. It is nearly impossible to tell from a speech transcript alone if a missed source citation is intentional or accidental, or if information wrongly attributed to one source rather than another is a deliberate deception or due to a mere error in memorization; in short, there is no way to *prove* anyone is *intentionally* doing something wrong. And yet, the speeches contain inaccuracies, incomplete citations, and references to sources that cannot be found and verified. These misuses of evidence are unacceptable from an academic standpoint, are not examples of the writing and research we should be rewarding, and may be in direct violation of the guidelines for fair competition. Though this study, like others before it, analyzes only a small sample of speeches, there is every reason to believe the same misuse of evidence is occurring at all levels of competition. Previous research on the existence of unwritten rules or conventions of competition indicates that, whatever the successful competitors are doing, everyone else is trying to emulate (VerLinden, 1996). Thus the credibility of all forensics competitors is compromised when we find evidence of evidentiary abuse at the highest levels of competition.

It is difficult to determine what the causes of this problem may be. Some have suggested that poor judging is to blame for undesirable trends in competition (Cronn-Mills and Schnoor, 2003; Paine, 2005). In particular, questions have been raised about the relative value of inexperienced or "lay judges" who may or may not know what to look for when judging (Mills, 1983). Regardless of one's opinion on the value of decisions and criticisms offered by lay judges, most tournaments are dependent upon them. The reliance on lay judges to make tournaments work is not a variable that many have the power to manipulate. An argument can be made that the fresh perspective offered by the relatively inexperienced judge can be beneficial to competitors (Ballinger and Brand, 1987).

Others have pointed to particular judging criteria as having a detrimental effect on the public address events. Richardson (1994) suggested the familiarity of the competitor may have some effect on ranking. "Source counting" (Billings, 2002) or privileging of recency in source citation (Kelly et al., 2008), instead of critical evaluation of the number and credibility of sources cited, are also concerns. The sheer volume or recency of sources should not be the primary criteria for judging evidence, though Ziegelmueller and Kay (1997) find it often is. Freely and Steinberg (2005) urged judges to look at the quality of argument, rather than the "cite count," though cite count remains a reliable predictor of rank (Billings, 2002). As students search for more variety and uniqueness in their source citations, all the while adhering to the privileged recency standard, they may find themselves turning to sources that are biased, obscure or even irrelevant (Billings, 2002; Cronn-Mills and Schnoor, 2003). This places an even higher burden of evaluation on the judge, who may or may not be familiar with the sources being cited.

The existence and proliferation of conventions or unwritten rules of competition may also have some bearing on the behaviors of individual competitors with regard to evidence abuse. There is a large body of research on the unwritten rules of specific forensics events (Ballinger and Brand, 1987; Crawford, 1984; Billings, 2002; Paine, 2005; Sellnow and Ziegelmueller, 1988; Reynolds, 1983; White and Messer, 2003; VerLinden, 1996). VerLinden (1996) explained that conventions are based on students' perceptions of why other competitors are successful, not any theoretical or pedagogical basis. Kelly and Richardson (2010) added that heeding these unwritten rules "maintains a high potential for abuse, thus compromising the pursuit of theory-supported educational outcomes." It is possible students are merely mimicking the behavior of other successful competitors. Billings (2002) and Gaer (2002) each described the manipulation of conventions in order to increase competitive success, even though adherence to this convention may stifle creativity. And, judges may be just as hemmed in by convention as competitors. When a judge must render a decision and a justification for that decision in the scant amount of time available during a round of competition, referring to conventions or unwritten rules may serve to simplify things (Paine, 2005). It may be "more sources" is not just an arbitrary and unenlightened comment on a ballot (Cronn-Mills and Schnoor, 2003), but a shorthand for "your argument is underdeveloped; you need more evidence to support your claims." Billings (2002) suggested judges should focus on argumentation, not the evidence citation. Previous research has pointed to the possibility that student competitors are simply not being taught how to properly construct an argument, much less how to properly cite the source of the evidence one uses to support it (Perry, 2002).

Even the most discerning judge, applying the most thoughtful analysis can be easily fooled, if that is the speaker's intention. Judges, no matter how determined, principled, and experienced, simply do not have the time to check the veracity of competitors' sources during a round of competition. Nor do they have the time or resources to look up obscure or little-known media outlets to judge credibility and appropriateness within a round of competition. The judges cannot be the last line of defense against evidence abuse.

It bears mentioning that there is a first line of defense against evidence abuse: the forensic coach. Coaches who are working with students in the research and writing phases of competitive preparation should be intimately acquainted with the sources of evidence being used by their students, and in a position to direct the students in the proper usage and citation of sources. This ideal situation, however, is often far from the reality for many teams, for a variety of reasons: insufficient coaching staff, inexperienced coaches, late additions to the team, or students who reject advice, to name a few. So how might the community address the persistent problem of evidence misuse and abuse?

In his original study, Frank (1983) hinted at a solution that may have merit. He suggested the national tournaments require students to submit a transcript of their speeches, just as the Interstate Oratorical competition does, and similar to the American Forensic Association's rule that competitors submit proof of eligibility for their national tournament. Perry (2003) echoed

this idea, suggesting competitors be required to "verify the accuracy of citations" (p. 63). A policy such as this would definitely have the effect of discouraging intentional evidentiary abuse at the national tournaments. However, there are several difficulties with this proposal: it would be difficult to achieve consensus on this matter within the various national forensics associations, which would be necessary in order to compel cooperation; while it would create a disincentive for evidentiary abuse, this policy would still not address sloppy or inaccurate source citations within the text of speeches; and, this policy would not directly address evidentiary abuses occurring at qualifying or regional tournaments. A competitor could easily "cheat" his or her way to qualification, and then clean up the speech before nationals.

However, if the intention is to reduce evidence abuse while restoring the educational integrity of an event that is riddled with arbitrary and undesirable unwritten rules, then why not do this by intentionally encouraging the development of a new unwritten rule? Burnett et al. (2003) stated that, because we already believe ourselves to be engaged in an educational activity, we are unmotivated to make systemic changes, which would lead in the direction of increasing educational value. The likelihood of creating consensus for a rule change in Persuasive Speaking (NFA) or Persuasion (AFA) seems low. But unwritten rules emerge every season, whether it applies to how an interper should hold the script book, or how many sub points one should have in an impromptu speech. Burnett et al (2003) argued there are "no educational unwritten standards," instead they are all competition-oriented. But this does not have to be the case. If a small but significant percentage of students were to engage in a new "convention" in persuasive speaking that addressed the abuse of evidence and impressed their judges with their commitment to academic honesty and ethical communication, this behavior would be rewarded, and, more importantly, emulated.

The behavior suggested is the preparation of an annotated bibliography of the sources of evidence used in the competitor's speech, prepared alongside the speech itself, and available in each round of competition, with enough copies for any judge who wanted to keep it. The effort and ability required to produce this bibliography would be well within the normal academic requirements of any college student, and the creation of this document could serve as an excellent teaching tool for the competitor and coach. Additionally, the presence of an actual printed copy of this bibliography, offered to the judge before the student begins presenting her or his speech, would enable students to reduce the amount of specific detail of each individual citation, thereby improving the auditory experience of the speech and drawing forensics speech more in line with real world communication (VerLinden, 1996). The proffering of such a document within a round of competition is likely to have a powerful effect on the judge and competitors, as well, reinforcing for each of them the importance of ethical research and attribution.

The presence of this bibliography would not, by itself, stop evidence abuse. It would, however, address the problem in the following ways:

1. The production of this document and the use of it in rounds of competition would serve to remind competitors, judges and coaches of our commitment to ethical communication and academic honesty.
2. The existence of a document that could be examined later for accuracy would deter students who may be tempted to fabricate, deceive or plagiarize, as well as serve as a way of weeding out speeches which may contain evidentiary abuse long before they get to a national competition.
3. It would be easier for inexperienced judges to focus on other aspects of the speech such as argument structure, if the sources were presented to them at the beginning.
4. It would reduce the need for specific detail in verbal citations, thereby reducing the danger of accidental mistakes and bringing the delivery style of forensics speech more in line with what is accepted outside forensics.

5. The necessity of justifying the source in the annotation of each entry would discourage adding sources just to increase the "cite count."

The use of a simpler reference list or basic bibliography would serve all the above purposes, but an annotated bibliography, with its summary or justification of each source listed, will have the additional benefit of requiring the student to state exactly why the source merits inclusion in the speech. This provides an opportunity and means for more critical thinking in the development of argument structure. The practice of using and citing evidence that contributes nothing to the building of an argument, merely to increase the number of sources, would be laid bare by the addition of an annotated bibliography.

Coaches could use the production of this bibliography as a developmental tool when teaching novices how to put together a persuasive address. It offers them an easy opportunity to broach the subject of academic honesty with their students and provides the student with a tangible reminder of this important lesson. Having the coach "sign off" on the annotated bibliography before competition is a useful way of assuring that all competitors on a team are adhering to the community standards and rules of competition.

If anyone, coach, competitor or judge, had reason to suspect that an individual competitor had engaged in evidentiary abuse, then the existence of this bibliography would facilitate the investigation of the situation, as well as protecting individual competitors against false accusations. Competitors would feel empowered to hold each other to a higher standard of evidence use and argument construction. Such discussions could occur throughout a season of competition, resulting in speeches being thoroughly vetted by both coaches and the competitors themselves before they make it to a national tournament. This emphasis on proper use of evidence in persuasive speaking may even carry over into other forensic events, ushering in an era of student-led insistence on ethical communication.

The abuse of evidence in persuasive speaking has been a problem for decades, and unless we take action to stop it, there is no reason to believe it will not continue. A practical approach to solving this problem is to use our community's tendency to create conventions and unwritten rules to actually increase the educational merit of our activity, rather than to obscure it. If educators and coaches were to introduce this idea to their teams now, we could have persuasive speakers using bibliographies by next season. We have seen this evolution of conventions happen time and time again with regard to performance details and style. Paine (2005) wrote that conventions are a "numbers game" – if enough students embrace a convention, judges become more likely to reward it. It is about time we ensure that honest, ethical, educationally sound student work has a chance to be rewarded.

References

American Forensic Association Code of Forensics Program and Forensics Tournament Standards for College and Universities, Article II: competitor practices. Retrieved April 15, 2014 from http://www.americanforensics.org/book/code-standards/article-ii-competitor-pra/code-standards.

Ballinger, B. & Brand, J. (1987). Persuasive speaking: A review to enhance the educational experience. *National Forensic Journal*, 5(1), 49-54.

Billings, A. (2002). Assessing forensics in the 21st century: Ten questions individual events programs must address. *National Forensic Journal, 20(1)*, 30-37.

Burnett, A., Brand, J. & Meister, M (2003). Winning is everything: education as myth in forensics. *National Forensic Journal, 21(1)*, 12-23.

Crawford, J. (1984). Toward standardized extemporaneous speech competition: tournament design and speech training. *National Forensic Journal, 2(1)*, 41-55.

Cronn-Mills, D. & Schnoor, L. C. (2003). Evidence and ethics in individual events: An examination of an AFA-NIET final round. *National Forensic Journal, 21(1)*, 35-51.

Del Casale, R., Malloy, M., Anten, T., Conaway, S., Kristofco, C., Mullin, L. and Rogowski, D. (2003). Response to: Engaging ethos: source citation accuracy in intercollegiate forensics. *National Forensic Journal, 21(1)*, 67-70.

Frank, R. L. (1983). The abuse of evidence in persuasive speaking. *National Forensic Journal, 1(2)*, 97-107.

Freely, A. & Steinberg, D. (2005). *Argumentation and debate: Critical thinking for reasoned decision-making.* Belmont, CA: Thompson-Wadsworth.

Gaer, D. (2002). Formulaic forensics: When competitive success stifles creativity. *National Forensic Journal, 20(1)*, 54-56.

Kelly, B., Kelly, T., & Schnoor, L. (2008). Did you read today's paper?: The erroneous privileging of evidentiary recency in the collegiate individual event of persuasion. *National Forensic Journal, 26,* 49-60.

Kelly, B. & Richardson, R. (2010). Documenting teaching efficacy: Pedagogical prerogatives, learning outcomes and the future of forensics as an academic activity. *National Forensic Journal, 28(2),* 170-195.

Kerber, A. & Cronn-Mills, D. (2005). The state of forensic scholarship: Analyzing individual events research in the national forensic journal from 1990-2003. *National Forensic Journal, 23(2)*, 69-82.

Mills, N. (1983). Judging standards in forensics: toward a uniform code in the 80's. *National Forensic Journal, 1(1),* 19-31.

National Forensic Association By-Laws, Updated and Approved Fall 2013. Retrieved April 15, 2014, from http://www.nationalforensics.org/about-nfa/governing-documents.

Paine, R. (2005). Identifying and evaluating the "unwritten rules" of competition. *National Forensic Journal, 23(1),* 79-88.

Perry, L. (2002). The need for a forensic civic virtue. *National Forensic Journal, 20(1)*, 71-73.

Perry, L. (2003). Engaging ethos: Source citation accuracy in intercollegiate forensics. *National Forensic Journal, 21(1)*, 52-66.

Richardson, R. (1994). Effect of familiarity on ranking in individual events competition. *The Florida Communication Journal, 22(1)*, 5-13.

Reynolds, C. (1983). "Winning" orations? A study of select interstate oratorical speeches. *National Forensic Journal, 1(2)*, 119-135.

Sellnow, T. & Ziegelmueller, G. (1988). The persuasive speaking contest: An analysis of twenty years of change. *National Forensic Journal, 6(2)*, 75-88.

Thomas, D. A. and Hart, J. (1983). Ethics in speech events: A replication and extension. *National Forensic Journal, 1(2)*, 75-95.

VerLinden, J. (1996). A critique of source citations in forensic speeches. *National Forensic Journal, 14(1)*, 23-36.

White, L. & Messer, L. (2003). An analysis of interstate speeches: are they structurally different? *National Forensic Journal, 21(2)*, 2-19.

Ziegelmueller, G. & Kay, J. (1997). *Argumentation: Inquiry and advocacy.* (3rd ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Amy Mendes is a visiting lecturer in speech at Berry College. This paper was originally presented at the National Communication Association Convention, Washington, D. C., November 2013. Correspondence to: Ms. Amy Mendes, Department of Communication, Berry College, Mount Berry, GA 30149. Email: amendes@berry.ed

Reimagining Metaphor in Rhetorical Criticism

R. Kyle Kellam
Marian University

This paper seeks to open a discussion about language use in rhetorical criticism. Analyzing the 2011 final round of rhetorical criticism at the NFA national tournament, the essay argues that competitors should reimagine the social scientific metaphors in contest rhetorical criticism that invite outdated, instrumental models of rhetorical criticism. Instead, an alternative vocabulary that constructs contest rhetorical criticism as a student-centered interpretive performance focused on discursive dynamics is proposed.

Since its inception as a competitive speech event, "rhetorical criticism" has provoked the ire of rhetorical critics. These concerns have focused on larger paradigmatic issues related to its transition from a scholarly enterprise into a competitive speaking event (Rosenthal, 1985; Murphy, 1988; Ott, 1998), but have also focused on specific practices like article misrepresentation (White, 2009; Willoughby, 2010) and the use of research questions (Paine, 2009). Building upon one another, these critiques provide an opportunity to question not only how one teaches or practices rhetorical criticism, but also the way knowledge is talked about. Contest rhetorical criticism fails deeper at the linguistic level than at the structural or procedural level. If, as Burke (1966) notes, language "reflects, selects, and deflects" culture, then the language choices in contest rhetorical criticism also make arguments about the way the event itself is conceptualized. Lakoff (1980) contends that this language is best understood through metaphor, or the understanding of one thing in terms of another. Considering that metaphor is a critical route to identifying core values within speech performance (Osborn, 1967), to better understand contest rhetorical criticism is to identify the metaphor used to describe it.

Thus, competitors' linguistic choices in contest rhetorical criticism metaphorically construct the event as a social science within an outdated, instrumental model of rhetoric. The communication discipline moved beyond these neo-Aristotelian models because they kept leading to conclusions that were predictable and formulaic in nature. Furthermore, they failed to highlight rhetoric's more important ethical or ideological dimensions. When student speakers use language that implies they are doing an effect-based social science rather than a discourse-centered social criticism, audiences are invited to imagine and affirm problematic and antiquated assumptions about communicative artifacts and rhetorical analysis. Worse, as educators, students' critical thinking opportunities are limited. If educators want to change how they think about rhetorical criticism to enhance pedagogy, then there is a need to change how students are taught to talk *within* it. This paper will analyze the final round of rhetorical criticism at the 2011 NFA national tournament, examining closely the metaphors students use that bill rhetoric as a social science. In doing so, an alternative language and practice to promote the teaching of

rhetoric as a vocabulary for interrogating the complexities of discursive dynamics will be proposed. Instead of relying on rhetorical criticism as a science, it will be reimagined through the metaphor of interpretation.

The Science of Metaphors

Metaphors are a useful way to examine both the language and ideology at work in contest rhetorical criticism because such analysis necessarily requires one to investigate what the content presents openly and also what the content obscures. Lakoff (1980) argues that this process occurs in the very "systematicity" of metaphors (p. 7). While metaphors facilitate a connection to language in unique and often clever ways, they necessarily work to obstruct other features of a multi-faceted concept inconsistent with the metaphor. For instance, as Lakoff has noted, if one is using war metaphors to talk about argumentation, then one is necessarily hiding the ways that argument can be thought of as something else such as dance. To demonstrate this difference, one might say that an argument was "right on target" or "indefensible" versus "elegant" or "in rhythm" with the discussion. In the case of contest rhetorical criticism, many of the competitors' language choices, which are then reinforced by the judges, work to highlight social scientific paradigms of rhetorical analysis while obscuring more contemporary, critical views of rhetorical criticism.

The first metaphor addressed is the research question. Research questions by themselves are not counterproductive to the overall research process. In scientific research, for example, the research question (either in lieu of a hypothesis or in conjunction with it) quite literally guides the research. Once the researcher has decided what he or she wants answered about a particular phenomenon, then he or she will choose a method that best answers the question (or tests the hypothesis). Even though rhetorical criticism does not necessarily require a research question like scientific inquiry does, the presentation of a question is not the issue. Asking questions is a natural part of inquiry. The issue resides more firmly in the implementation of the research question as it is currently practiced and rewarded in forensic competition.

This comes in a couple of forms. The first issue is with the resolute expectation of the research question. All six speakers in the round analyzed presented a research question in their speech, indicative of forensic competition as a whole. Omission of a research question in rhetorical criticism is an extremely rare occurrence. This question, as often emphasized, was prompted by some sort of significant information concerning the artifact. "Considering [this piece of socially significant context], we [will, must, can] ask the following [research] question." For instance, the sixth-place speaker Marsh argued:

> Given that this park exploits the deaths of nearly two million people, and has been denounced by members of both the local and international communities as being morbid and insensitive, we must ask the following research question: How do the attempts by the Cambodian government to profit from the atrocities of the Khmer Rouge alter the public memory of the genocide?

Again, not all questions are bad questions, (Marsh's question included), but when students are automatically expected to have a research question, or worse penalized if they do not, the forensic community encourages students to contrive questions into criticisms that may not actually need them. Instead of offering a strong thesis for the speech, the student presents a question answerable without the analysis, or they just copy

the research question offered in their scholarly article. By merely switching the text, but leaving the question intact, the student fails to embrace his or her role as the critic and invent new observations. Paine (2009) argues, "Students who seek to answer their artificially-duplicated research questions can only replicate the same answer discovered by the original author" (p. 100). When research questions become a necessity rather than an option, we are imagining and operating rhetorical criticism as a kind of scientific inquiry and limiting its unique capabilities for the student to practice the rhetorical art of invention through argument.

The way research questions are worded also frame contest rhetorical criticism as a social science, especially when keywords invite yes/no or cause-effect answers. Martin, the third-place speaker, exemplifies this issue with his question: "In light of Dow's long delayed shift to responsibility, should the Yes Men's communicative efforts be labeled a success?" This question does both. On one hand, Martin is asking a question that requires a yes or no response, which operates in an absolutist paradigm and assumes that the communicative act's meaning is fixed, black or white. Rather than having the potential to operate in many different ways rhetorically, the communicative efforts are either successful or they are not. His answer as predicted is a "resounding yes." This approach works to obscure the complexity of rhetorical dynamics that make communicative acts rich texts because they necessitate the clear-cut categories of science.

Also, the speaker's question is problematic because it is really asking the question "Was the act successful?" Since the ideological turn in rhetorical criticism, scholars have moved away from this kind of inquiry for a couple of reasons. First, questions of ideology and ethics have become more important than questions of effectiveness. Certainly, it might be argued that the speech produced certain desired results, but is that really more important than how it potentially utilized unethical means to do so? As Rosenthal (1985) argues, "In making a rhetorical evaluation, the critic should not be limited by the classical perspective, with its emphasis upon ascertaining the effect of the rhetoric" (p. 135).

The second reason actually works to negate the first because it questions if rhetorical methods are even capable of measuring effectiveness or intent. How can critics know what someone truly intended and if the perceived effects were a result of the criticism? These kinds of questions are not relevant to contemporary modes of criticism, but instead are rather classical, instrumental models that construct rhetoric as strategic rhetoric. Modern-day rhetorical scholars have left such work on effects to survey or experimental research. As a result, when students ask these types of yes/no or cause-effect research questions starting with "does" and uses terms like "success" within the speech, the criticism is read as scientific, as the preferred method for answering such a question. This type of research question sets a tone for scientific inquiry in the speech.

Advancing through the body of the orations, the next place contest rhetorical criticism becomes metaphorically constructed as social science is within what has commonly been called the "method" section of the speech. There are multiple issues/metaphors here. First, the label "method" is itself a metaphor of social science. To use the term suggests that the process of criticism is methodical, or that it should be performed step-by-step and without deviation. Both Paine (2009) and Ott (1998) agree that we misuse "method" in rhetorical criticism, but the issue here is with the implementation of the term at all. The term "method" misdirects because it calls us to

imagine the speech as a distinctly scientific project, where the preceding section was "literature review" and the proceeding one is called "results." A "discussion" will be surely to follow. A method section feels like an absent orphan, missing its scientific brothers and sisters as it attempts to cohabitate with unlikely friends like "critical implications."

The method metaphor goes beyond its label, however, and also extends into its function and development within the speech. Students commonly break down their method into three digestible parts called "criteria" or "tenets." According to the student, the author of their article argues that these tenets must be fulfilled by the artifact in order for it to possess whatever rhetorical quality is at play. For instance, Suhr, the fifth-place speaker, explains that "one can escape symbolic entrapment yet maintain their social identity by using three vocabularies of motive: normative, transforming, and neutralizing motives." If the agent utilizes these three strategies, then, Suhr argues, they will avoid symbolic entrapment. This process is reminiscent of genre-based criticism, where artifacts are measured by prescriptive generic elements to determine if something is, for example, a good or bad comedy, apology, or Stanley Kubrick film. Artifacts are not allowed to expand or grow the genre as potentially members of it but instead are only measured against existing categories as successes or failures.

This approach raises a few important concerns and manifests in a variety of ways. First, it puts the theoretical framework in charge of the analysis, not the speaker. Instead of the critic making insights about an artifact using a toolbox of theory, the speaker argues that this theoretical framework will generate, or worse prove, particular insights. Ott (1998) argues that this approach is often preferred because contest rhetorical criticism "is still caught in the 1960s model of methodological pluralism. Although student criticisms are characterized by a wide variety of theories, the overall approach to [rhetorical criticism] continues to entail a narrow and reductionist conception of method and to be animated by method" (p. 65). When the speakers put the onus of responsibility on the theory to drive the analysis, they rely on scientific logics to make sense of such an approach. Paine (2009) asserts:

> The writer-critic must be free, based on their analysis of the rhetorical text at hand, to make choices about which specific rhetorical constructs will and will not be essential in order to unlock certain aspects of the text (not all aspects) from this particular critical angle, with no presumption being made that this is the "only" viable angle, or even necessarily the "best" angle. In fact, the words "only" and "best" are invalid and intellectually stunting descriptors of the task being attempted (p. 99).

Terms like "criteria" and "tenets" are germane to genre-driven or broader social scientific perspectives where something must be tested against these criteria to meet particular results. If they pass the test, they fit. All the critic need do is "run the data" and see what is produced as a result.

Second, it is not just that students use these scientific terms to label their theoretical dynamics, but the way they assert those dynamics that also duplicates the scientific absolutism of their supposed methodological approach. This happens in two ways. First, it occurs throughout the speech in what is often called on ballots the "must language" of contest rhetorical criticism. Speakers will often claim that in order for their artifact to be [this rhetorical quality], it "must meet the following three tenets." While no

student in the round used this phrasing exactly, the "must language" emerges in other forms as part and parcel of the same metaphor. For example, Marsh claims on behalf of her primary scholar Bost that "a memorial *ought* to commemorate individuals in a manner that uses the original killing grounds" and "*ought* to offer commentary on the events it commemorates." Both examples invoke criterion-based criticism and instrumental models of intent because particular criteria are offered that a text should or must meet. Also, in her implication section, Miller, the first-place speaker, feels she must revisit the notion of experience as a point of contention because "the first tenet of the model *demands* that you live the experience."

However, it is not just that the theoretical perspective alone requires such things of us as the audience. This language extends into other parts of the speech as well. For example, Cochran, the fourth-place speaker, argues, "Since one group has come to dominate Christian dialogue in our country, we *must* ask ourselves: How does Tea Party Jesus begin the renegotiation of the conservative Christian cultural identity?" Also, Seboldt, the second-place speaker, claims:

> The Saudi fatwa is different than most culture jams, considering that this traditionally Western technique is operating in the Middle East and has been far more successful than its Western counterparts. Therefore, we *must* ask the research question: How does the rhetorical use of culture jamming change within the unique authoritarian environment of Saudi Arabia?

Furthermore, Suhr argues in her implications, "The rhetoric surrounding the Ark Encounter *forces* future scholars to consider how many people need to be impacted before symbolic entrapment can be escaped at the community level?" Also, she claims before her conclusion, "This reaction *forces* us to consider how we address symbols that entrap." By empowering the theory to direct the analysis and using language that reasserts this power, the students are then driven to let this logic trickle into other parts of the speech.

The final way that the "method" section asserts dominance over the criticism is how its structure creeps in the analysis, or what conventions encourage students to call the "application" section of the speech. All six speakers used the term "apply" in their preview when discussing what they were going to do with their method in relation to the text. As used in this way, the term "application" no doubt remains consistent with the metaphor of "method." To analyze the artifact using theory would imply something different at play than an application of that theory. To critique a text might invite original, emergent insights from using theory to help dissect its parts, to help the critic to see what he or she will see. An application on the other hand merely asks, or perhaps demands, that students must lay the method over its components and list what they see, much like tracing pencil sketches on an illustrator's light table. With the light shining from underneath the table, the illustrator need only to lay a fresh piece of paper on top of the sketch and trace over the lines in ink. Like the illustrator, the students bring nothing new "because [they] merely apply the tenets of the methodology to the artifact in a 'cookie-cutter' fashion that limits originality and thought" (Willoughby, 2010, p. 18).

In order to feed the method/application metaphor, students employ the language of "fulfillment" to the analysis. If the text meets certain qualities as previously outlined by the theory, then the text will "fulfill the tenet." For instance, both Seboldt and Marsh reiterate, "Thus fulfilling the first tenet" and "Thus, it fulfills the first tenet" respectively.

Additionally, because students are essentially enslaved to their theoretical perspectives, they will sterilize their artifacts to remain true to point one, where the "method" is constructed. So the artifacts function as evidence to the method and are also subject to abuse for the sake of clean parallelism. Furthermore, by having the aligned parallelism, students do not have to usually question the genre or its supposed tenets.

Yielding to the theory for critical judgment is scientific and strange in context on its own merit, but when criteria are not met the situation grows peculiar. For instance, Cochran argues that his text does not meet his final tenet. Marsh even claims that her text "fulfills the core of all of Bost's tenets, but what it fails to fulfill is the spirit of this model…Bost's model should be refined to include a greater focus on the memorialization of victims, the creation of dialogue, and education over entertainment." A common response from a judging paradigm would be to question why one would choose a method that does not fit. A critical rhetorician might question how texts can fulfill or not fulfill theory. Instead, an alternate function for this kind of response can be offered.

This is a moment where the cracks and fissures in the ideology of the scientific metaphor become apparent, but the student fails to recognize their opportunity to operate outside of it. The faulty logic of science in rhetorical criticism doubles back on itself to create a fallacious loop. Consider it, in light of the popular and poignant 1999 film, a "blip in the Matrix." In the case of Marsh, her statement may be interpreted to loosely mean, "Even though my memorial fulfilled all the generic tenets of what a memorial ought to have according to my method, it is not an ethical memorial and is laden with harmful ideology. As a result, we need to change this theory to account for that." So when the artifact offers deeper insight than her limiting theory allows, she says the theory needs changing. What she has failed to realize is that she has just become a critic doing criticism. She looks at the text, and using theoretical tools, makes interesting arguments about its rhetorical function. Marsh is so blinded by the scientific metaphor, however, that she questions the validity of her method, not the potency of her text. Murphy (1988) notes, "The difficulties that distress many educators can be understood and alleviated if students, coaches, and judges make the text of the artifact, not the methodology, the focus of the critical process" (p. 1).

This breakdown is an intersection for many issues with the social scientific metaphor of contest rhetorical criticism. In this statement, which she attempts to describe within the scientific metaphor, Marsh calls attention to how her theory-driven analysis positions her text as successful because it met all the criteria of the theory, but was still not worth celebrating because it was harmfully ideological. Unintentionally she critiques her own genre, effects-driven approach more than she does her artifact. This alternative explanation can be offered because Marsh's statement that a text does not "fulfill a tenet" or "fit the spirit" of the theory does not really make sense within the metaphor of social science *or* social criticism. As a result, it becomes a perfect critical moment to recognize the disruption in the social science metaphor and its questionable fit in contest rhetorical criticism.

A Critical Choice

Research questions, methods, "must language," and applications are all metaphors that—at best—function together to describe instrumental, neo-Aristotelian, genre-driven,

effects-based methods of rhetorical criticism. At worst, they outright construct contest rhetorical criticism as a social science. When students repeat this language over and over in competition and coaches and judges reward students for this description, the community learns that the structural limitations of the event, which scholars work very hard to combat, make perfect sense. Changing the way of doing rhetorical criticism in forensic competition to a more textual-centered process will never seem like a viable option if the way everyone talks about the event invites social scientific logic and rationality. A perspective that embraces bias, the very ontology of textual-centered criticism, will never be embraced if the language used perpetually tells us that bias is wrong. Seeing the gray in the lived world has little room in criticism if all speak in the scientific world of black and white. And, as made clear in looking at the 2011 final round of rhetorical criticism at the NFA national tournament, students will continue to demonstrate these self-created woes in contest rhetorical criticism if the metaphors invite them to do so.

Thus, an alternative vocabulary is offered as a starting point to shift the talk about contest rhetorical criticism and how students might speak differently within the content of their speeches. This new vocabulary may invite a more critical, textual-focused analysis in the event where students are empowered to make their own informed observations about significant communicative artifacts. A very obvious, but seemingly overlooked, place to begin is with the event's purpose as described in the NFA by-laws (2013). The purpose reads that a rhetorical criticism is "a speech designed to describe, analyze and evaluate the rhetorical dynamics related to a significant rhetorical artifact or event." This part of the description provides terminology that students can work with to replace the existing scientific metaphors. Namely, the word "dynamics" offers an alternative metaphor than the words "tenet" or "criteria." Whereas the latter suggest rigid categories for a student to check off when evaluating a text and puts the theory in control of the criticism, the term "dynamics" calls students to imagine a textual uniqueness that justifies or at least invites a critical examination. It moves away from the generic sorts of criticism where students merely locate if something "fit" the criteria for its own formalized sake. Dynamics are inherently complex, and they provide space for a multiplicity of meanings and interpretations to be made between critics and audiences, which invite more original, critical insight. In short, dynamics embody the spirit of cultural criticism.

Two other advantages of using dynamics as a metaphor for contest rhetorical criticism immediately emerge when considering its use in both competition and education. First, dynamics suggest that these are elements of the artifact that the student has *chosen* to see, even if it was theory that gave the student a lens to identify and refine its peculiar quality. The important part here is that the student noticed the dynamic(s) and then employed theory to accent and shape his or her critical observations without losing what made the artifact interesting to begin with. Also, a cluster of dynamics appears subject to change. Dynamics seem contextually bound, reimagining with the adjacent discourses that help constitute its meaning. Such a perspective can actually offer more social relevance for the student. When a social context of some cultural or political significance is the chosen backdrop for the text at hand, and the text is framed by that context through these rhetorical qualities, then it seems that this relationship of text/context enhances those same dynamics. Playing hand-in-hand with the first characteristic, changing contexts give the student more opportunity to see the dynamics

that speak to them specifically as a critic.

Pragmatically, when a student is able to "analyze and evaluate the rhetorical dynamics" of a text, they no longer simply "apply tenets" to an artifact. Instead, students can explore those dynamics *within* the artifact. This leads to a second alternative metaphor, "analysis" over "application." If students are encouraged to not merely "apply the tenets" of the framework to their artifact, but instead to "analyze rhetorical dynamics" within it, then they may be encouraged to extrapolate new insights regarding their text. Rosenthal (1985) echoes these thoughts when he argues, "The analysis should do more than merely 'pigeon-hole' elements of the persuasive process, since good criticism involves both analysis and synthesis" (p. 137). And coaches should invite students to analyze and synthesize in their criticisms, escaping the entrapment of scientific absolutism, because criticism "is not a science, rather, it is an art" (p. 133).

In moving to the term "analysis" to describe point two of the speech, students also begin to take power away from the theoretical framework of the speech. Instead, the student fully takes on the role of the critic, making individual choices and critical insights about the text. Another alternative metaphor would assist with this shift. Rather than calling point one of the speech the "method" section of the speech, it might be more helpful to just call this section "theory" or "theoretical perspective." Where the term "method" implies a prescribed process, the metaphor "theory" simply suggests a collection of loosely organized concepts to be rearranged and used as needed. The term "perspective" places the focus on the viewpoint of the author. "Theories" and "perspectives" invite building, but "methods" do not. Furthermore, theories are open and subject to change because it is in their very nature. This is why they are called "theories" and not "laws." By changing the first point of the speech to invite more of a theoretical *perspective*, the student might be encouraged to feel more empowered as a critic, taking agency away from the theory. As a result, students may also feel more confident in discarding the practice of using a published rhetorical criticism as a model for criticism. Instead, they might be more likely to employ general perspectives like feminism or colonialism that offer open interpretation.

A subtler change that students can make toward embodying the critic is to replace "must" language with "can" language. As I write on many ballots, "Rhetoric never must. It only can." Students should offer room for the multiplicity of rhetoric, and the word "can" facilitates this move because it accepts the polysemic nature of criticism. It allows room for audiences to work with the rhetoric more constitutively. When a student says that rhetoric "must" do this or "forces" us to do that, it once again takes power away from the critic to embody their own perspective, which is the spirit of social criticism. Identifying dynamics at play in a text, students make arguments about what rhetoric *can* do, not what it *must* do. Rather than focusing on the scientific notion of proof, students shift their focus to understanding the artifact's rhetorical potential. As the critic, the student argues that this text can make meaning in particular ways and that this meaning is rhetorically interesting for various reasons. This once again shifts the onus of the analysis away from the theory and on to the speaker.

It may be prudent to offer an alternative to the hotly debated research question that has crept its way into contest rhetorical criticism. If the idea that *expecting* a research question sets the tone for social scientific inquiry, then one should consider what might set a stronger tone for critical interrogation. Instead of students asking already answered

questions in the introduction and baiting the audience through their contrived analyses, why not just present the insights from the beginning? With this approach, students take the focus away from the theory to generate the insights, which firmly places it into their own hands. After providing social significance, the student can admit to the audience what they find rhetorically interesting about the text and how they intend to make arguments about its rhetorical functionality. Naturally, the student will use theory to support this perspective, but the theory becomes secondary to the arguments.

Some may argue that this is what students are essentially doing already with the question, that this suggestion of an argument splits hairs over form. This may be the case. As a judge, one can answer most research questions in contest rhetorical criticism before points one and two are heard. After all, the issue is not with students focusing the analysis around rhetorical concepts. Instead, the presence of the question in its current form sets the tone for scientific, rather than rhetorical, inquiry. The research question when practiced this way allows the rest of the scientific metaphors in the speech to make sense. If the student presents a yes/no or cause/effect research question, then it only seems logical that he or she has a methodical approach to answering it. This method will tell the student what to see in the artifact because all he or she needs to do is apply the method to the text. Metaphors collectively sustain ideology because they work together to maintain the same features of an idea while also joining their forces to obscure others. As metaphors reflect particular logics between one another, it gets more difficult to see outside of them because preferred frames become reinforced and naturalized.

This essay attempts to disrupt these frames and expose the scientific language at play in contest rhetorical criticism so that our students may be taught to find alternative ways of talking about it. As Paine (2009) so astutely argues, "The philosophy we accept dictates the forensics world we build" (p. 94). Perhaps instead of "social science" as the preferred metaphor for contest criticism, the field might find a concept more productive in social knowledge that students and coaches already widely accept in competition: *interpretation*. Admittedly, to do rhetorical criticism is not to compete in prose or poetry, but to understand contest criticism as "interpretation" gives students the creative license to determine original insight and invites them to interact with the artifact in a way that embraces subjectivity and co-creation with the text. A metaphor of "interpretation" would embrace "rhetorical dynamics," "perspective" and "argument." It would ask the judges to reward students who internalized the text to make arguments authentic. "Interpretation" would acknowledge, as Ivie (1995) has argued, that rhetorical criticism itself is a *performance*. While "interpretation" may not completely solve the social science dilemma in contest rhetorical criticism, it at least offers another way to talk and think about it.

To summarize the reimagined metaphor:
1. Use "dynamics" instead of "tenets" or "criteria."
2. "Analyze" dynamics rather than "applying" tenets.
3. Refer to point one as "theoretical perspective" not "method."
4. Employ "can" statements in lieu of "must" statements to talk about rhetoric and criticism.
5. Use an argument to guide the analysis as opposed to a question. At the very least, open a space through coaching and judging practices where questions are not implicitly required.

The goal is for students to learn how to find their own voice in rhetorical criticism because that is precisely what makes the event so special. It should not be a practice of creating the most systematic, reifying analysis of a flashy artifact or "cutting the most precise cookies." Contest rhetorical criticism should be a place where students feel empowered to say really smart things about communicative artifacts that are perhaps not so apparent to others. Students should make their best efforts to offer narrow, subversive meanings of discourse because that is just another way they become conduits of social change through forensics. It is hoped that this alternative vocabulary may serve as the next step in reconceptualizing contest rhetorical criticism as a place where students realize they can find their own scholarly voice with no competitive or educational cost.

References

Burke, K. (1966). *Language as symbolic action: Essays on life, literature, and method.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Final round of rhetorical criticism. (2011). Perf. J. Cochran, M. Marsh, P. Martin, L. Miller, A. Seboldt, and B. Suhr. National Forensic Association National Tournament. Illinois State University, Normal, IL.

Ivie, R. (1995). Productive criticism. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 81*, 1.

Lakoff, G. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Murphy, J. M. (1988). Theory and practice in communication analysis. *National Forensic Journal, 6*(1), 1-11.

National Forensic Association by-laws. (2013). Retrieved November 16, 2013, from https://sites.google.com/site/nationalforensicsassociation/about-nfa/governing-documents.

Osborn, M. (1967). Archetypal metaphor in rhetoric: The light-dark family. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 53*(2), 115-126.

Ott, B. L. (1998). Bridging theory and practice: Toward a more pedagogical model of rhetorical criticism. *National Forensic Journal, 16*(1), 53-84.

Paine, R. E. (2009). New wine in old wineskins: Questioning the value of research questions in rhetorical criticism. *Speaker & Gavel, 46*, 94-104.

Rosenthal, R. E. (1985). Changing perspectives on rhetorical criticism as a forensic event. *National Forensic Journal, 3*(2), 128-138.

White, L. (2009). Distortion in the description of scholarly research methods in competitive forensics. *Speaker & Gavel, 46*, 105-119.

Willoughby, H. (2010, November). Methodological mishaps: The problem of missing rhetorical theory in contest rhetorical criticism. Paper presented at the National Communication Association national convention, San Francisco, CA.

R. Kyle Kellam is an assistant professor in the Department of English and Communication at Marian University. An earlier version of this essay was presented at the National Communication Association annual convention in Washington, D.C., November 2013. The author would like to thank co-editors Randy Richardson and Kathy Brittain Richardson, Robert Frank, George LaMaster, and the anonymous reviewers for their critical insights. Correspondence to: R. Kyle Kellam, Department of English and Communication, Marian University, 3200 Cold Spring Road, Indianapolis, IN 46222, USA. Email: rkellam@marian.edu.

WHAT WE ARE TRYING TO TEACH
Reconnecting Collegiate Forensics to the Communication Discipline

Dr. Brendan B. Kelly (Chair)
University of West Florida
Dr. Richard Paine
North Central College
Dr. Randy Richardson
Berry College
Dr. Leah White
Minnesota State University-Mankato

For decades the assessment of what constitutes "quality performance" in collegiate forensics has been rooted in a mysterious and unsupported collective conception of unwritten rules and performance practices related to a very narrow and instinctive set of standards. This casual system for documenting the efficacy of teaching practice in collegiate forensics is insufficient to meet the standards and expectations for higher education *assessment* in the 21st century. What was formerly a trend toward considerations of assessment in higher education has become the dominant model demonstrating the relationship between teaching and learning outcomes. This document marks a concerted attempt by the National Forensic Association to move away from assessment standards that reflect the tapered view of a specific community, and toward pedagogical prerogatives fully relevant and strongly tied to the foundations of the Communication discipline. The treatment of each element is rooted in the realities of current practice. Prerogative components are not oriented toward reshaping the scene (i.e. altering the circumstances of competitive collegiate tournaments, etc.), but rather toward defining pedagogical expectations for coach, teacher, student and competitor.

The document features descriptive analysis of prerogatives for collegiate forensics pedagogy organized in two tiers. Each section is fashioned as a series of "statements of purpose." The term *purpose,* in this regard, is related to roots and motivations for teaching. This document recognizes the shaping of *best practices in forensics pedagogy* as a central goal for the collegiate forensics community. The full measure of the components in each tier work to shape the *purpose* of teaching and coaching practices that resist replication of past performances and move toward speechmaking and performance development founded in the root principles and rhetorical foundations celebrated in the scholarly and professional study of human communication. A third tier that would address each event individually is strongly suggested during the course of future development.

Tier one represents broadly conceived statements of purpose relevant to rhetoric and performance pedagogy in the Communication discipline. The statement set relates to

elements of public communication that are large in scope and constitute common considerations in the practice of effective public speaking and performance. Key areas of emphasis in this section include the critical nature of considering audience, occasion, topic/text, etc. in successful public speech.

Tier two emphasizes the performance genres common to forensics pedagogy in individual events at the collegiate level: public address, limited preparation speaking and oral interpretation. Tier two narrows the focus of the statements of purpose so as to consider unique aspects of each genre. While many of the same subject elements (i.e. topic/text selection) that appear in tier one are addressed in tier two, the utility of the tiered approach is revealed in the increasingly intricate analytic content.

While not addressed in this document, tier three would emphasize the selection of individual events independently. This section would be unique in comparison to the previous tiers in its content construction. In this tier, only elements that are specifically relevant to an individual event, but not emphasized in a previous tier, would be addressed. Therefore, for example, the discussion of prose interpretation would only feature analytic content related to the establishment of clear and distinct pedagogical prerogatives for that particular event.

Development of tier three analytic material would constitute the *next step* in the development of common assessment.

ACADEMIC LEARNING COMPACT (ALC)

The National Forensic Association Academic Learning Compact incorporates student learning outcome activity across five domains that should characterize the skills and abilities of a successfully trained student/competitor in collegiate forensics, regardless of the program, which they represent. The Academic Learning Compact[1] should align with the following four domains.

- DISCIPLINE KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS (ALC 1)
    - (ALC 1.1) Use communication technology effectively.
    - (ALC 1.2) Describe and apply communication concepts and principles from the following areas:
        - Rhetorical theory
        - Fundamentals of speech
        - Audience analysis
        - Fundamentals of oral interpretation of literature
        - Argumentation
- COMMUNICATION (ALC 2)
    - (ALC 2.1) Adapt style and delivery to communication clearly and memorably.
    - (ALC 2.2) Deliver effective presentations with well-defined introductions, main points, supporting information, and conclusions.

---

[1] The domains in the *Academic Learning Compact* are drawn from those approved by the Florida Board of Governors, which oversees the Florida State University system (11 public universities). The ALC presented in this document reflects the spirit of the content specifically utilized in the Department of Communication Arts at the University of West Florida.

- • (ALC 2.3) Establish credibility with audience.
  - • (ALC 2.4) Use information technology effectively to conduct research.
- • CRITICAL THINKING (ALC 3)
  - • (ALC 3.1) Apply rhetorical, relational and critical theories to understand communication events.
  - • (ALC 3.2) Evaluate effective and ineffective communication.
  - • (ALC 3.3) Suggest audience-centered strategies for improvement in public speaking and performance that are considerate of the speaker
  - • (ALC 3.4) Identify trustworthy evidence and information.
- • INTEGRITY/VALUES (ALC 4)
  - • (ALC 4.1) Distinguish between ethical and unethical behavior in human communication.
  - • (ALC 4.2) Describe and adhere to the principles of ethical practice in public speaking, performance, scholarly activity and citizenship.

The ALC establishes the broadly-based outcome goals for learning in collegiate forensics. The descriptive analytic content outlined in the tiers 1 and 2 are aligned with the ALC.

TIER ONE
COMPREHENSIVE LEARNING OBJECTIVES

PRAXIS FOUNDED IN DISCIPLINARY PRINCIPLES: Comprehensive performance evaluation as "best practice" in forensics pedagogy

The duty of educators is to help students strive to achieve an array of educational learning objectives. Thus, speech and performance critics should guard against the tendency to let any one learning objective—the desire to stay "in time," the desire to see students speak "without notes," etc.—dominate the judging decision to the exclusion of other important learning objectives. That is not to say that a single factor, element or consideration cannot emerge as the dominant factor in a critique. However, an adjudicator in collegiate forensics must ensure that the general basis for critique and evaluation be reflective of a multiplicity of factors.

Effective human communication is not reliant on the successful performance of a single communicative facet. Therefore standards for evaluation of speech and performance must reflect a comprehensive consideration of scene, act, agent, agency, and purpose.

RATIONALE: COMMUNICATION ETHICS
The basis for assessing collegiate forensics education is founded in the rhetorical tradition. To that end, the National Forensic Association commits to a series of principles that focus competitive and educational practice toward ethical rhetoric.
Rhetoric:
1. serves the end of self-discovery, social knowledge, or public action more than personal ambition;

2. avoids intolerance and acknowledges audience freedom of choice and freedom of assent;
3. is reflexive in including self-scrutiny of one's own evidence, reasoning and motives;
4. is attentive to data through use of accurate, complete, and relevant evidence and reasoning and through use of appropriate field-dependent tests for soundness of evidence and reasoning;
5. is bilateral, meaning it includes mutuality of personal and intellectual risk, openness to the possibility of self-change, and openness to scrutiny of others;
6. is self-perpetuating. Disagreement on a subject leaves open the possibility of deliberation on other subjects and of later deliberation on the disputed subject.
7. Also, human capacities for persuasion, in ourselves and in others, are nurtured through what Henry Johnstone terms the habits of resoluteness, openness, gentleness, and compassion; embodies [an] attitude of reasonableness, including willingness to present reasons in support of our views, tolerance of presentation of reasons by others, respect for the intrinsic worth of the other person as a human, and avoidance of personalizing the controversy. (Johannesen, Valde &Whedbee, 2008, p. 62)

RATIONALE: TEACHING
Collegiate forensics is, at its core, an extremely effective model for teaching communication principles. As such, the National Forensic Association aligns itself with the ethical standards of the discipline at large. The practice of forensic pedagogy shall align with the National Communication Association's (NCA) *Code of Professional Ethics for the Communication Scholar/Teacher.* The tenets of this code of ethics should inform casual and formal coaching practices, pedagogical goal setting, and standards of excellence in forensic teaching.

While the NCA code was designed for traditional classroom pedagogy, the unique tutor-style teaching mode inherent in forensic pedagogy neatly links to the more broadly based articulation of ethical principles for the communication discipline.

CODE OF PROFESSIONAL ETHICS FOR THE COMMUNICATION
SCHOLAR/TEACHER
Our primary responsibilities as communication teachers rest in being knowledgeable, communicating what we know in a fair and accurate manner, acting as ethical role models for students, and establishing relationships with students that enhance learning and encourage students to behave ethically.

Most important is the area of academic integrity. As teachers, we maintain high standards of academic integrity by:
• Teaching only those courses for which we have academic credentials, that is, preparation in the subject matter area and knowledge of current thinking and research related to the course material.

- Helping all students to develop their fullest academic potential; encouraging them to become engaged in learning, to think critically about readings and lectures, to reflect on what they learn and, when appropriate, to disagree with what is presented; and to participate with faculty and other students in research projects and activities.
- Acknowledging scholarly debates where they exist and helping students understand the nature of scholarly controversy, rather than presenting controversial material as "truth."
- Engaging in classroom practices only to the extent that one is qualified to do so. For example, communication teachers should not assign exercises requiring self-disclosure by students, unless they have provided ways for students to avoid making significant disclosures without penalty. Nor should communication teachers attempt to lead exercises designed to reduce communication apprehension without being trained to do so. In designing classroom activity, the ethical communication teacher avoids putting students at psychological or emotional risk.
- Using with care exercises or assignments that may conflict with the closely held values of students. Instructors must be open to allowing alternative assignments when students object for personal reasons.

Communication teachers display personal integrity in the classroom by their own use of ethical behaviors and by refusing to encourage or tolerate unethical behavior. As communication teachers, we strive to treat all students fairly and we are always concerned with fairness. We model fairness in the classroom and require that students value fairness by insisting on respectful and civil expression when discussing differing viewpoints. We encourage listening to others and presenting ideas accurately, while acknowledging differences in points of view and personal biases. We provide, and encourage students to provide, constructive feedback to others in the class while acknowledging the value of opposing arguments and evidence. We try to foster freedom of expression and a safe classroom environment in which students communicate candidly and thrive intellectually.

We respect and honor culturally based differences in communication and presentational styles in and outside the classroom. That respect calls for encouraging students to communicate in multiple ways, depending on what is most appropriate and effective for given contexts and communication goals. We strive to treat all students equally by not allowing personal pre-dispositions or biases to influence how we teach and interact with students.

We demonstrate respect for students by acts of confidentiality, keeping grades and other personal information about students private. In other matters we are honest and open. We present course objectives and requirements fully and communicate clear criteria for grading and evaluating student achievement. We present ourselves honestly to students and others, accurately describing our professional credentials, qualifications, and knowledge.

We endeavor to assess student learning using methods and instruments that are free of bias and that provide an equal opportunity for all students to perform well. We assess students' work based on the quality of content, not the viewpoints presented.

Finally, we accept our professional and social responsibilities as communication educators by endeavoring to improve public understanding of communication theory, research, and practice. When the opportunity presents itself, we provide information and instruction to students and others about ethical communication and how to think and behave as ethical communicators.

BEST PRACTICE-STUDENT SCHOLAR/COMPETITOR
Collegiate forensics is designed to provide students a unique set of educational opportunities in which they are challenged to make communication choices (performance-based, analytic, political, etc.) in public forums. The basic premise that must function as the foundation for this form of learning is a stringent code that compels students to make ethical choices as a foundational consideration of audience.
The initial set of guidelines that shall govern practice in this realm is the *National Forensic Association Code of Ethics.*
ALC Alignment: ALC 4.1; ALC 4.2

THE AUDIENCE MUST ALWAYS BE TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT
RATIONALE
It is widely agreed that "effective public speakers are continuously audience-centered" (Sellnow, 2003, p. 58). This concern for the audience extends "throughout the speechmaking and presentation process" and has an impact on the speaker's choices concerning content, structure, delivery, and so on (Sellnow, 2003, p. 58). Even speeches that are presented multiple times must remain flexible living organisms, which adapt to the demands of the immediate context (occasion and audience). As Jaffe (2007, p. 71) explains, "even politicians, salespersons, or university recruiters, who present the same material repeatedly, adapt their material to each audience and each setting." As explained by Gregory (p. 67), "many people find it helpful to view such analysis and adaptation as a form of *customizing*, a popular strategy in the business world…Customizing in public speaking means tailoring a speech to a listeners' knowledge level, needs, and interests…In public speaking, as in clothing, it isn't true that 'one size fits all.'"

Unfortunately, the challenge to develop audience analysis skills is severely constrained by the current nature of forensics tournaments, where students are challenged to speak to basically the same amorphously defined audience of professional forensics coaches mixed with widely assorted lay judges week after week. This constraint is made still more daunting by the fact that contest rules generally require public address speeches to be fully researched, composed, and memorized in advance. The ability of students to make on-the-spot audience adjustments mid-presentation is thus somewhat limited.

This draws our attention to a consideration of the similarities and differences between "the audience of the moment" (the particular judge or judges in the room) and the larger more extended community or audience who the critic is being asked to represent, and reminds us of the responsibility of adjudicators to prioritize the targeting of audiences-as-groups over the targeting of audiences—as—individuals. This also suggests that tournament organizers and judges can promote the educational needs of students in this area by looking for innovative ways to confront students with diverse audiences (mock or real in nature).

Operating within this constraint, however, it is still important to recognize audience analysis as an important learning goal. A demonstration of a speaker's consideration of audience must be reflected in all performance choices (topic choice, physical and vocal performance variables, etc.).
STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOME:
The student will demonstrate that they have studied and adhered to relevant principles of audience analysis. It is understood that any given presentation cannot possibly take into account the specific tastes and background of the particular judge(s) assigned to adjudicate a particular section of competition, and that students should not be expected to anticipate or satisfy the purely personal interests and preferences of individual critic judges. However, students should demonstrate their awareness of, concern for, and focus on reaching the general community embodied by the "listening other."
ALC Alignment: ALC 1.2; ALC 2.1; ALC 2.2; ALC 2.3; and ALC 3.3

THE SPECIFIC OCCASION MUST ALWAYS BE TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT
RATIONALE:
As noted by O'Hair, Stewart and Rubenstein (2004, p. 99), speakers must consider "the logistics of the actual speech setting—size of audience, location, time, seating arrangement, and speech context." In some ways, the situations encountered by students in collegiate forensics routinely replicate themselves. Regardless of the time of year or the particular tournament host, many elements of the speaking situation are highly standardized. However, these speaking occasions can be highly diverse in other ways. The sheer logistics of room size, furniture layout, lighting, extraneous noise, external distractions and so on may significantly impact the speaking situation. Audience size can vary from one (the critic judge) to a few (in an average preliminary round) to many (in average elimination rounds). The time of day, the geographical region, recent world events, and many other factors may operate to modify the speaking situation. A demonstration of a speaker's consideration of occasion must be reflected in all performance choices (topic choice, physical and vocal performance variables, etc.).
STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOME:
To the maximum reasonable extent, students should demonstrate an awareness of, a concern for, and an ability to adjust to the unique demands and constraints of the particular speaking situation.
ALC Alignment: ALC 1.2; ALC 2.3; ALC 3.1; ALC 3.2 & ALC 4.1

TIER TWO
GENERAL LEARNING OBJECTIVES: PUBLIC ADDRESS

AREA ONE: AUDIENCE ANALYSIS
RATIONALE:
See full explanation provided under the Tier 1 objectives, #1.
STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOME:
The student will demonstrate that they have studied and adhered to relevant principles of audience analysis. It is understood that any given presentation cannot possibly take into account the specific tastes and background of the particular judge(s) assigned to adjudicate a particular section of competition, and that students should not be expected to

anticipate or satisfy the purely personal interests and preferences of individual critic judges. However, students should demonstrate their awareness of, concern for, and focus on reaching the general community embodied by the "listening other."
ALC Alignment: ALC 1.2; ALC 2.1; ALC 2.2; ALC 2.3; and ALC 3.3

AREA TWO: ANALYSIS OF THE OCCASION
RATIONALE:
Even though forensics competitors may memorize the speeches they present at forensics tournaments, and even though those tournaments may possess a great number of similarities, it is still undeniably true that each individual round of competition confronts speakers with a situation that is "unique" in many ways.

The time of day, the season of the year, recent world events, physical traits of the room, the size and nature of the audience, and many other factors combine to make each speaking situation different from any other. Thus, forensics speakers should not look at their pre-memorized public addresses as unchanging fossils, which have been "locked in amber." Rather, the speech must remain open to adjustments in language (Verderber and Verderber, 2005, p. 62), adjustments to the physical environment (Verderber and Verderber, 2005, p. 84), adjustments to the time of day (Jaffe, 2007, p. 80), and so on.
STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOME:
To the maximum reasonable extent, students should demonstrate an awareness of, a concern for, and an ability to adjust to the unique demands and constraints of the particular speaking situation. (This replicates Learning Objective 1:2).
ALC Alignment: ALC 1.2; ALC 2.3; ALC 3.1; ALC 3.2 & ALC 4.1

AREA THREE: TOPIC SELECTION
RATIONALE:
Topic selection is always an important issue for speakers to confront. And while the degree to which a topic holds potential interest for the audience to be addressed is certainly an important component of this decision, it is far from the only thing to be considered. As students move into the world beyond college, they will often be asked to address topic areas they would not otherwise have selected. And no matter how broad or how narrow the choice parameters speakers are given to work with may be, they will universally face challenges concerning the narrowing of those topics, the choice of a perspective to take on those topics, and the choice of which topic components to highlight or privilege. Thus, Gregory suggests that topic selection reflect what the speaker truly cares about (p. 90) and be researchable (p. 92).

This implies that speakers should demonstrate passion toward and a breadth of knowledge concerning the topic they consider. Furthermore, given the fact that forensics presentations are offered up within the context of a shared community experience, rather than in a purely personal one-on-one conversational context, the selection of "socially significant" topics, which are important to the larger community, is to be expected. Students bear the burden of establishing for the audience the social (as opposed to the personal) significance they believe resides in the selected topic.
STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOME:
Students should select a socially significant topic which they demonstrate a personal concern for, which they demonstrate a rich understanding of, and which can reasonably

be assumed to be of interest to the targeted audience. The scope of the student's discussion of this topic should be optimally narrow/broad, and the student should adopt a clear and comprehensible perspective toward that topic.
ALC Alignment: ALC 1.2; ALC 2.3; ALC 3.1; ALC 3.2 & ALC 4.1

AREA FOUR: RESEARCH
RATIONALE:
It is a basic ethical requirement of public speaking that speakers be as fully informed as possible concerning the topics they discuss with audiences. Plato stressed this requirement, and theorists ever since have similarly emphasized it. For example, Everett Lee Hunt (1955) reminds us that the duty of speakers is to help audiences make "enlightened choices," and notes that "an enlightened choice is a choice based upon a wide knowledge of all the alternatives...Such dignity as man may have is achieved by the exercise of free choice through the qualities of learning.The man who lacks learning is often narrow-minded, ignorant, and dogmatic..." (p. 114).

In order to achieve even a minimally acceptable level of knowledge, research is obviously required. This is particularly true for student speakers, who typically discuss topics relative to which their personal expertise is severely limited. Thus, student speakers are forced to "borrow" both knowledge and credibility from others.

In order to amass an appropriate knowledge base, students must absorb a substantial quantity of information. However, the sheer quantity of sources cited is not by itself a sufficient means of measuring the quality of a research effort. Beyond this baseline expectation, the student is responsible for evaluating the materials gathered in terms of their accuracy, credibility, relevance, and so on (Verderber and Verderber, 2005, p. 314). Nor is the recency of source cites by itself an absolute evaluation criterion, since older information may still be accurate, relevant, and important to the speech's argument.

Once the student has determined what material to include in their speech, proper credit needs to be given to all sources from whom information has been drawn. Thus, students are expected to provide sufficiently detailed source citations as needed. Students are responsible for knowing and abiding by general academic standards concerning oral and/or written plagiarism. All information drawn from research sources should be cited, and the bibliographic information provided in those source cites must be accurate. Thus, one resolution passed by the Summer 2008 National Developmental Conference on Individual Events states that:

> Plagiarism, distortion, and falsification must be opposed by the community and by individual coaches who model the highest possible standards.
> A. The community should take additional steps to ensure that speeches are genuinely the work of the students presenting those speeches, noting the ethical threats posed by over-involved coaches and peers.
> B. The community should educate students about the nature of plagiarism and should take steps to enforce plagiarism standards.

STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOME:
Students must be well informed on the topic at hand and demonstrate detailed and coherent knowledge of the topics discussed, making use of appropriate (credible and relevant) research sources and providing accurate source citation information. Oral plagiarism must be strictly avoided.

ALC Alignment: ALC 1.2; ALC 2.3; ALC 2.4; ALC 3.4 & ALC 4.2

AREA FIVE: ORGANIZATION
RATIONALE:
According to Gregory (p. 202), speakers should employ clear organization in order to make their speeches easier to understand, easier for audiences to remember, and more likely to be believed. Thus, as noted by Sellnow, "clear organization is important to any message you send…You will not make sense to your listeners if your ideas are not clearly organized" (2003, p. 171). As described by Sellnow, this organization involves such macrostructural issues as the use of a standard tripartite structure (introduction/body/ conclusion), an appropriately chosen organizational pattern (topical, chronological, spatial, etc.), transitions, internal previews and summaries, and so on. While the forensics community may practice certain conventions at any given time, there is a clear distinction between "unwritten conventions" and general learning goals. Forensics seeks to teach students the importance of understanding and employing appropriate organizational patterns, which maximize the audience's ability to understand, remember, and act on the information provided in the speech.
STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOME:
Students should employ organizational structures, which incorporate such basic elements as a clear specific purpose (and/or thesis statement), an appropriate structure-forecasting device, adequately developed transitions, and a discernable introduction/body/conclusion structure.
ALC Alignment: ALC 1.2; ALC 2.2; ALC 2.3 & ALC 3.2

AREA SIX: LANGUAGE (STYLE)
RATIONALE:
The classical canon of style emphasizes the importance of word choice, of the language we select to clothe our ideas. It calls on speakers to pay attention to more than content alone, and to recognize that the precise words we use to convey that content have a powerful effect on the audiences we speak to. In ancient times, Hermogenes' *On Types of Style* avowed that the seven key qualities of style are clarity, grandeur, beauty, rapidity, character, sincerity, and force (Golden et al., 2007, p. 100) Today, according to Jaffe (2006, pp. 240-246), the most basic stylistic requirements faced by the speaker involve choosing language that is accurate, appropriate, concise, clear, concrete, and interesting. Relative to the last of these, Jaffe argues that speakers should "use colorful, vivid language to keep listeners' attention and interest…by incorporating alliteration, rhyming, repetition, personification, hyperbole, metaphors, and similes." One specific topic that falls within the realm of style is the issue of elitist language (sexist, ageist, ethnocentric, etc.).
STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOME:
Students should employ language, which is accurate, appropriate, concise, clear, concrete, interesting, aesthetically pleasing, and supports and enhances the content of the speech. Students should avoid the use of elitist language.
ALC Alignment: ALC 1.2; ALC 2.1; ALC 3.2 & ALC 3.3

AREA SEVEN: VOCAL DELIVERY
RATIONALE:

For public speakers, the significance of possessing strong delivery skills is beyond question. Sellnow (p. 256) urges, "don't underestimate the importance of delivery. According to research, listeners tend to be influenced more by delivery than by the actual content of speeches (Decker, 1992, cited in Sellnow). In fact, some 55 to 90 percent of the meaning listeners grasp is essentially derived from delivery."

As Sellnow (pp. 257-259) goes on to observe, "nonverbal communication is inevitable" (every message contains nonverbal components), "nonverbal communication is culturally and situationally bound" (the same cues may mean different things to different people in different situations), "nonverbal cues are believed" (the power of nonverbal communication can and does trump the power of words to convey meaning) and "nonverbal cues are seldom isolated" (multiple cues are transmitted simultaneously by the voice and body). This reality requires speakers to develop excellence in both vocal and physical skills.

In relation to vocal delivery specifically, the various skills that contribute to the success or failure of speakers are legion. Jaffe (pp. 261-265) highlights such specific issues as pronunciation, articulation, stress, accents and dialects, clarity, volume, pitch, rate, and the use of pauses. O'Hair, Stewart and Rubenstein (pp. 243-245) supplement this list with their discussion of "natural delivery," enthusiasm, attitudes of confidence and competence, tone (and monotone), rhythm, and vocal fillers. Sellnow (2003, pp. 268-272) stresses the issues of intelligibility, vocal variety, and conversational style.
STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOME:
Students should employ vocal delivery, which is intelligible, varied, conversational, enthusiastic and confident. In order to do so, students should demonstrate the effective use of pronunciation, articulation, stress, accents and dialects, volume, pitch, rate, pauses, tone and rhythm while avoiding vocal fillers and distracting vocal patterns.
ALC Alignment: ALC 1.2; ALC 2.1; ALC 2.3

AREA EIGHT: PHYSICAL DELIVERY
RATIONALE:
Effective delivery demands excellence not only in terms of vocal nonverbal skills, but equally well-developed physical delivery skills as well. Again, the issues related to physical delivery which challenge the speaker are multiple and diverse. Sellnow (2003, pp. 260-261) highlights the importance of space (taking into account the size of the audience, the cultural context of the speech, the size of the room, the group's density, seating arrangements, and the speaker's distance from the audience), time (arriving at an appropriate time and adhering to established time limits), appearance ("studies show that a neatly groomed and professional appearance does send important messages about a speaker's commitment to the topic and occasion as well as about their credibility"), eye contact, facial expressions, gestures, posture, and body movements. Speakers need to take into account not only what *should* be done, but also what *should not* be done. For example, Gregory (1996, p. 314) warns speakers to "make sure they do nothing to distract the audience: don't…jingle keys or coins, rifle note cards, fiddle with a watch or jewelry, adjust clothing, smooth your hair, rub your chin, or scratch any part of your body."
STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOME:
Students should demonstrate effective physical delivery skills, taking into account such issues as the use of space, time, professional appearance, eye contact, facial expressions, gestures, posture, stance, and body movements. Students should avoid distracting

physical actions.
ALC Alignment: ALC 1.2; ALC 2.1; ALC 3.2 & ALC 3.3

AREA NINE: MEMORIZATION
RATIONALE:
Memory was one of the five basic canons of rhetorical study considered by the ancient Greek and Roman scholars (Golden et al., 2007). Defined as vivid recall of the speech at the moment of utterance, the canon of memory stressed the importance of the speaker's "being able to utter the words in the actual moment of presentation to the audience" (Golden et al.,2007, p. 9). Today, "memoria means practice, practice, and more practice, so that the orator may be ready to express what had been planned" (Golden et al., 2007, p. 9). As we attempt to help student speakers accomplish this task, speech communication teachers discuss the relative benefits and drawbacks of the manuscript vs. fully memorized vs. extemporaneous vs. impromptu methods of speaking in any given context. While the formal rules which regulate any given speech contest may differ, the goals being sought by the speaker remain quite consistent.

Irrespective of how memorized (or not) the speech is, the speaker should deliver a speech which satisfies the learning objectives already identified. In other words, the speech should be clear, intelligible, well organized, employ effective eye contact and gestures, sound natural and conversational, cite sources accurately, and so on.

If the rules for a particular contest allow or advocate the use of extemporaneous or impromptu delivery in public address events, then the adjudicator should evaluate the degree to which the learning objectives specified elsewhere in this document are indeed satisfied. If the rules allow or advocate the use of manuscript delivery, the speaker should still demonstrate a high degree of familiarity with the script, which evidences a substantial preparation effort and enables strong vocal and physical delivery skills. If the rules allow or advocate a completely memorized presentation, then students should demonstrate thorough memorization, which facilitates the comprehension of the speech. While "perfectly flawless memorization" may be the ideal, striving for this level of memorization should not be allowed to exonerate the student from meeting other learning objectives. Thus, seamless memorization should not be allowed to excuse factual errors, source citation mistakes, or "robotic" delivery. Furthermore, memory "glitches" must be considered in relation to the degree to which the student satisfies (or fails to satisfy) other learning challenges.
STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOME:
The degree of memorization evidenced by the student should satisfy the rules of the contest and should demonstrate that the student has invested an appropriately rigorous amount of time in practice sessions.
ALC Alignment: ALC 1.2; ALC 2.1; ALC 2.3 & ALC 3.2

TIER TWO
GENERAL LEARNING OBJECTIVES: ORAL INTERPRETATION

AREA ONE: FUNDAMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS FOR THE ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT OF PERFORMANCE CRITICISM

RATIONALE:

As taught in contemporary forensics, teachers and students draw from and make use of theories provided by two primary historically evolving bodies of theory, typically referred to as "oral interpretation" and "performance studies." Both of these bodies of thought are well grounded in existing research, and thus any given interpreter may well demonstrate performance choices supported by one or both of these traditions. The key question is not "*which* paradigm does a student adhere to," but rather "are the performance choices justifiable in relation to an overarching disciplinary theory?"

Best practices in performance criticism in collegiate forensics must represent a consideration for the complete spectrum of conceptions of value, since each of these evaluation measures contributes to the education of a student-competitor. It is a basic ethical requirement for adjudicators in collegiate forensics to engage in performance criticism on the basis of foundational principles, which support the scholarly and professional study of human communication. This brand of founding is particularly challenging in the realm of oral interpretation because the nature of "founding" for the subject area is persistently a subject of debate among professionals. However, common practice in performance criticism has emerged in the predominance of universal validity of essentialist categories. Whitaker Long (1991) references Barbara Herrnstein Smith's perspective on the suspect inherency in "value": "All value is radically contingent, being neither a fixed attribute, an inherent quality, or an objective property of things but, rather, an effect of multiple, continuously changing, and continuously interacting variables or, to put this another way, the product of the dynamics of a system, specifically an economic system" (Whitaker Long, 1991, p. 107). Whitaker Long suggests that value in performance is not fixed in individual activities and social/institutional practices (p. 109). Rather, "it is produced and sustained by continuous evaluation, which may include 1) self-appraisals, 2) individual responses, 3) implicit endorsements, 4) casual judgments, and 5) institutionalized forms of evaluation" (p. 109). The recognition that performance criticism is a continuous process in which conceptions of value and learning outcomes emerge from a variety of evaluative sources is essential to ensuring a high level of pedagogical integrity.

Whitaker Long (1977) argues that a critic's reasons for evaluation and assessment must be "grounded in the demands of the particular text performed, and observable to be those a critic can translate in terms of the performer's audible and visible behaviors" (p.270). The assessment of performed literature requires a critic to provide clear reasoning for a verdict. Moreover, that verdict must be grounded in an evaluative system that exists outside of personal preference. "The pluralistic critic recognizes the diversity of literature and searches for the fairest and most illuminating critical method with which to approach a given text" (Whitaker Long, 1977, in Doyle & Floyd, p. 272). As such, the practice of performance of literature within forensics is informed by both traditional approaches to Oral Interpretation as well as more recent developments in Performance Studies.

STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOME:

Student oral interpretation performances shall be informed by traditional principles of Oral Interpretation and/or more recent approaches to performance articulated in the field of Performance Studies.

ALC Alignment: ALC 1.2; ALC 2.1; ALC 2.3 & ALC 4.2

AREA TWO: TEXT SELECTION
RATIONALE:
Given that all interpretation of literature begins with the selection of a text, attention should be given to issues related to identifying subject matter that has what Gura and Lee (2005) refer to as "literary worth" (p. 15). They explain that it is not enough for one to simply *like* a piece of literature; the text itself must demonstrate qualities as good literature. Gura and Lee (2005) suggest the touchstones of *universality, individuality* and *suggestion* should be the primary factors to consider when determining if a text has literary worth. Universality means the "idea expressed" in the selected literature "touches on a common experience" and "the emotional response it evokes is one that most readers (and listeners) have felt at one time or another" (Gura & Lee, 2005, p. 15). This factor is, however, present in even the most sophomoric of writing, so Gura and Lee (2005) stress the importance of the second factor of individuality. Individuality is "the writer's own fresh approach to a universal subject" which is "revealed in choice of words, images, and method of organization" (Gura & Lee, 2005, p. 16). They add that one's ability to recognize individuality is highly dependent on one's exposure to a wide variety of literature. In other words, the more our students read and see literature performed the better equipped they should become at recognizing individuality in literature. The final factor Gura and Lee (2005) suggest one consider is suggestion, which is present when "readers are left with something to do, with room to inhabit the work" (p. 16). Quality literature allows the reader, and in turn the performer, the opportunity to "enrich the subject matter from their own backgrounds...Once the possibilities for relevant association are realized, however, the writing continues to grow in meaning and in emotional impact for both the interpreter and the audience" (Gura & Lee, 2005, p. 16). An awareness of these factors of quality literature can assist students in making wise choices regarding text selection.
STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOME:
Students should be able to discern if a text demonstrates "literary worth" based on the literature's ability to recall a common emotional experience, reveal the presence of unique content and structure and leave room for individual imagination.
ALC Alignment: ALC 1.2; ALC 2.1; ALC 2.3

AREA THREE: TEXTUAL ANALYSIS
RATIONALE:
The disciplinary origins of Communication Studies as a field are found in English departments. As such, the practice of oral interpretation of literature is one of the earliest signs of the evolution of a new field. Core to oral interpretation's roots in English is the practice of textual analysis of literature. This focus on textual analysis remains a fundamental first step in creating a successful performance of literature. Yordon (2002) defines interpretation as "an artistic process of studying literature through performance and sharing that study with an audience" (p. 14). The close study of a text allows a performer to make "well-reasoned performance decisions" as well as introduce listeners to possible new insights the performer has revealed through that analysis (Jaffe, 2006, p. 52). As performance theorists have noted, "we have moved away from the bifurcation of script analysis and performance, as if the two were discrete processes, and we are confident that performance analyzes the text instead of being merely a product of

analysis" (Hopkins & Long, 1981, p. 237). Therefore, within forensic practice we recognize the interdependent nature of analysis and performance.

Although there are a multitude of analytic methods one can use to analyze literature, Gura and Lee (2005) argue a basic understanding of the key structural and aesthetic components of a literary work is what is needed to create a performance of literature. Regardless of which components are explored, the textual analysis of literature is fundamental to all interpretation events in forensics.

Miller (1998) argues current practice is better represented by the term "performance of literature" as it represents the presentation of a wider collection of works than the earlier emphasis given to classics.

STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOME:

Through performance, students should be able to demonstrate they have analyzed the structural and aesthetic components of the selected text.
ALC Alignment: ALC 1.2; ALC 3.1; ALC 3.2; ALC 3.3 & ALC 4.2

AREA FOUR: TEXTUAL CONTINUITY AND INTEGRITY
RATIONALE:
"Asked how far a conductor's liberties extend, one music critic answered: as far as his imagination takes him—so long as he preserves the known characteristics of the music" (Whitaker Long, 1977, p. 276, in Doyle & Floyd).

Performed literature supplies students with a multitude of opportunities to reconceive a text through performance. However, this process of possessing, reshaping and, often, reconceptualizing a text should not alter the text so fully that the performance fails to honor the point of view devised by the author. While the term "author's intent" problematizes some of the fundamental foundations of performed literature, the notion of *honoring the literary voice* of the author captures the spirit of the idea (yet relieves the conception of troubling components). Whitaker Long (1977) alludes to the fact that literary texts contain some *certainties*. These are aspects or characteristics of a text that "undoubtedly exist" (p.276). These aspects of the text are excluded from categories of textual aspects that are dependent on interpretation.

At the other end of the scale, *distortions* are performance choices, which violate these certainties, and thus need to be avoided. Between these two poles lie the concepts of *probabilities* and *possibilities,* which constitute the literary ground which a performer of literature can and must "interpret" in order to embody the inherent life of a text. A performer is challenged to honor the literary voice, while creatively engaging a personal, individualized and audience-centered performative interpretation of the literature.

STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOME:

Students, following intensive study of the relationship between literature and the interpretation and performance thereof, will demonstrate and honor the literary voice inherent in the selection of literature. This shall be evident in cutting and physical performance choices.
ALC Alignment: ALC 1.2; ALC 2.1; ALC 2.2; ALC 3.3; ALC 3.4; ALC 4.1 & ALC 4.2

AREA FIVE: CHARACTER PERFORMANCE CONTINUITY AND INTEGRITY
RATIONALE:
A performance of literature needs to clearly present the narrator of the text, therefore an

understanding of point of view is crucial to developing the continuity and integrity of the performed characters. Gura and Lee (2005) define point of view as "a way to experience the world from a particular vantage point. Every narrator sets for us—by the position from which the action is viewed *and* by his or her unique personality—a characteristic way of showing and telling" (p. 233). Forensic performers must be aware of the different aspects of point of view in order to clearly communicate a text's narrator(s). Once a narrator has been identified, the performer's responsibility shifts to developing the use of voice and body to effectively present the voices in the text. Yordon (2002) states, "each narrator will have a unique voice, body, psychology, and emotional make-up. Analyzing the narrator's point of view and particular attitude toward the story and the characters in it is the first step toward developing a voice, body and emotional response for that narrator" (p. 189).

The divergence of contemporary theories of Performance Studies from traditional theories of Oral Interpretation is arguably most vivid in relation to the issue of the physical dimension of performance. Yet the diversity of opinion concerning what boundaries performers can and/or should operate within while reading literature aloud are not a strictly modern phenomenon. Tracing his analysis back to the Elocutionists and the school of Delsarte, Beloof (1966) notes that "[o]f all the aspects of reading aloud, perhaps the problem of the proper handling of the body is most controversial. For this immediately involves questions of taste and of style, two highly variable, in fact, two inevitably variable, aspects of any appreciation or practice of art" (p. 68). Yet within this diversity, all would agree that the interpreter's body plays a key role in the performance of literature.

According to Gura and Lee (2005), this understanding of the body's role in performance involves such issues as posture, gesture, kinesics, muscle memory, muscle tone, sense imagery, empathy, and so on. These physical choices are intimately enmeshed with the choices made by the reader in terms of vocal performance. Thus, Beloof (1966) explains that oral interpretation "is the handmaid of a verbal art, an enormous and subtle system of available signs, already existing at the other extreme from the emblematic. The interpreter's task is to bring those abstract signs to life. He [or she] must illuminate or intensify in the imagination of the listener, by means of vocal and bodily gestures, the reality which the author's imagination saw" (p. 73).

STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOME:

Students should be able to differentiate between first-person, second person and third-person point of view and apply this to the development of a narrator voice in a performance of literature through the use of appropriate vocal and physical expression.
ALC Alignment: ALC 1.2; ALC 2.1; ALC 2.2; ALC 2.3

TIER TWO
GENERAL LEARNING OBJECTIVES: LIMITED PREPARATION

AREA ONE: LIMITED PREPARATION
RATIONALE:
Public speaking with limited time to prepare encompasses a vast array of contexts on the public speech landscape, but occupies only a small corner of forensic practice. Limited preparation events, impromptu speaking and extemporaneous speaking, are unique among

the forensic canon in that they are the only events primarily identified by modes of presentation rather than content genre. Communication textbook authors from Andrews et al. (2008) to Zarefsky (2007) discuss impromptu and extemporaneous speaking as types of delivery, providing a valuable starting point for generic justification.

Offering education opportunities in speaking with limited preparation provides students with valuable practice in the most common, practical and useful realms of public speech. In reference to extemporaneous speaking, O'Hair, Stewart and Rubenstein (2004) observe, "Probably more public speeches—from business presentations to formal public addresses —are delivered by extemporaneous delivery than by any other method" (p. 255). Zarefsky (2007) comments, "[t]his mode is recommended for most speakers and speeches because it encourages a conversational quality and is flexible enough to permit adaptation to feedback" (253-54). Beebe and Beebe (2000) conclude, "[e]extemporaneous speaking is the approach most communication teachers recommend for most situations" (p. 280). And while there is great agreement among text authors on the practicality of extemporaneous speaking in the public speaking context, most authors point out that impromptu speaking is the most common genre for everyday speech. Lucas (1998) argues, "[i]n fact, many of the speeches you give in life will be impromptu" (294). From classrooms to boardrooms, town hall meetings to business meetings, dinner toasts to job interviews, impromptu speaking skills enhance the rhetorical effectiveness of numerous vital public speech efforts. Education, training and practice in limited preparation speaking contexts play a major role in comprehensive public communication education.

STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOME:
The student, constrained by strict time limitations, will be able to prepare and deliver speeches.
*ALC Alignment: ALC 1.2; ALC 2.1; ALC 2.2; ALC 2.3; ALC 3.1; ALC 3.2; ALC **3.3***

AREA TWO: SPEECH CONTENT
RATIONALE:
The fact that limited preparation events are primarily distinguished and described as presentational modes renders scholarly discussion of limited preparation speech content limited, at best. Preston (1992) reaffirms this observation and notes that even as types of delivery the terms "impromptu" and "extemporaneous" are often confused or used interchangeably. In the forensic context, the central content expectation of limited preparation speeches is that the speech should function as an argument (Pratt, 1981). This foundational premise provides focus and direction for speech content while prescribing that speakers have a worthwhile purpose for their utterance. An argumentative perspective suggests that speakers should offer a discernible thesis drawn specifically from the topic or question at hand. A clearly structured argument should be previewed and developed.

Pratt's (1981) description of limited preparation final round contestants describes the argumentative process.

> …they advance, support and criticize claims and they give reasons as justification for acts, beliefs, attitudes and values. They use a variety of supporting data to try to establish subordinate claims; once established, those subordinate claims serve as data for a central claim they have made, either in answering their extemp

question or in responding to their impromptu topic (p. 380).
An argumentative model of competitive limited preparation speaking invites comparison of argumentative depth and sophistication (Petrello, 1990). Beyond simply filling time, students are expected to articulate clear positions and develop well-supported arguments within the given time constraints.
STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOME:
In response to a given topic or question, the student will present a clear, cogent, developed argument.
ALC Alignment: ALC 1.2; ALC 2.3; ALC 2.4; ALC 3.1; ALC 3.4; ALC 4.1; ALC 4.2

AREA THREE: CRITICAL THINKING
RATIONALE:
The ability to offer clear, cogent, well-reasoned argumentation in a limited time frame requires the development and refinement of critical thinking skills. In reference to extemporaneous speaking, Aden and Kay (1988) argue that "success… requires contestants to understand complicated subjects of worldly importance, to analyze and synthesize, and to display their intellectual wares by powerfully and persuasively presenting their judgments to a myriad of critical listeners" (p. 43). Contest extemporaneous speaking challenges students to critically consider the significant international and domestic issues of the day.

Aden (1992) further explains the critical thinking process in the following way: Analysis forces the speaker to select from among the most essential components of an issue. Synthesis requires the speaker to pull together a coherent whole out of the essential elements. "Persuasive appeal encourages the speaker to make choices under analysis and synthesis that will create the most compelling speech for the particular audience" (p.178)

Critical thinking is essential in analyzing the social, political and/or economic context of the topic as well as the immediate rhetorical situation of the speech itself. Impromptu speaking provides unique challenges that are equally dependent on critical thinking skills. The Aristotelian concepts of invention and memory play central roles in the impromptu process (Reynolds and Fay, 1987). The discovery of ideas engages the student in a search of one's own "storehouse of knowledge" (memory) for the selection of the most salient ideas. This discovery sets in motion the analysis and synthesis of information that is essential for the development of argument. Rhetorical choices are made related to critical inquiry encompassing both topic and audience. The connotative, ambiguous nature of language reflected in impromptu topics (often quotations) stimulates critical and creative thought processes.
STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOME:
The student will demonstrate effective rhetorical choices grounded in critical inquiry regarding topic and rhetorical situation.
ALC Alignment: ALC 1.2; ALC 2.1; ALC 2.3; ALC 2.4; ALC 3.1; ALC 3.2; ALC 3.3 & ALC 3.4

AREA FOUR: SPEECH DELIVERY
RATIONALE:
The terms "impromptu" and "extemporaneous" are most often employed by communication scholars when considering modes of speech delivery. While it is

common for the terms to be used interchangeably (Preston, 1992), most textbook authors clearly delineate their differences. The definitions offered by Lucas (1998) typify scholarly categorization. An impromptu speech refers to a "speech delivered with little or no immediate preparation," while an extemporaneous address is described as "a carefully prepared and rehearsed speech that is presented from a brief set of notes" (294-95). The major definitional difference between the two would appear to be preparation time, rehearsal and the use of notes. However, when offering advice on impromptu speaking, many textbook authors (Osborn and Osborn, O'Hair, Stewart and Rubenstein, to name a few) recommend the use of brief notes. On the other hand, Beebe and Beebe (2000) allow for the exclusion of notes in extemporaneous style, claiming that it involves "[s]peaking from a written or memorized speech outline without having memorized the exact wording of the speech" (p. 280). Textbook authors commonly contrast the conversational nature and flexibility of impromptu and extemporaneous modes with the relative rigidity of manuscript and memorized styles. They also point out that audience expectations regarding delivery fluency and polish are generally lowered in limited-preparation contexts.

STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOME:

The student will be able to deliver a conversational, reasonably fluent speech with the aid of limited notes, if desired.

ALC Alignment: ALC 1.2; ALC 2.1; ALC 2.2; ALC 2.3 & ALC 4.1

REFERENCES

Aden, R. C., & Kay, J. (1988). Improving the educational value of extemporaneous speaking: Refocusing the question. *The National Forensic Journal*, *VI* (Spring), 43-50.

Aden, R. C. (1992). Making rhetorical choices: The parallel between extemporaneous and presidential speaking. *Argumentation and Advocacy*, *28*(Spring), 178-184.

Andrews, J., Andrews, P. H., Hogan, J. M., & Williams, G. (2008). *Public Speaking & Civic Engagement.* New York: Pearson Custom Publishing.

Beebe, S. A., & Beebe, S. J. (2000). *Public Speaking: An Audience-centered Approach* 4th ed. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Beloof, Robert. (1966). *The Performing Voice in Literature*. Boston: Little Brown.

Code of Professional Ethics for the Communication Scholar/Teacher. (2009). National Communication Association.

Golden, J. L., F. B. Goodwin, Coleman, W.E., and Sproule, J.M. (2007). *The Rhetoric of Western Thought From the Mediterranean World to the Global Setting.* 9th ed. Boston: Kendall/Hunt Company.

Gregory, H. (1996). *Public Speaking for College and Career*. 4th ed. New York:McGraw Hill.

Gura, T. & Lee, C. (2005). *Oral Interpretation.* 11ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Hopkins, M.F. & Long, B.W. (1981). Performance as knowing and knowing as performance. *Central States Speech Journal*, *32*, 236-242

Hunt, E. L. (April 1955). Rhetoric as a humane study. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 41:2,* pp. 114-117.

Jaffe, C. I. (2006). *Performing Literary Texts: Concepts and Skills*. Belmont, CA: Thompson Wadsworth.

Jaffe, C. I. (2007). *Public Speaking: Concepts and Skills for a Diverse Society.* 5th ed. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Johannesen, R.L., Valde, K.S. & Whedbee, K.E. (2008*). Ethics in Human Communication* 6th ed. Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press.

Lucas, S. E. (1998). *The Art of Public Speaking.* 6th ed. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Miller, L.C. (1998). "The study of literature in performance: A future?" In S. J. Dailey, (Ed.), *The Future of Performance Studies: Visions and Revisions* (pp. 51- 55). Annandale, VA: National Communication Association

O'Hair, D., Stewart, R., and Rubenstein, H. (2004). *A Speaker's Guidebook*. 2nd ed. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's.

Osborn, M., & Osborn, S. (1993). *Public Speaking.*3rd ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Petrello, R. C. (1990, November). *Impromptu speaking: A rationale for a pedagogy of argumentative sophistication.* Paper presented to the Speech Communication Association Convention, Chicago, IL.

Pratt, J. W. (1981). *In what ways is argument applied in the non-prepared speech events?* Paper presented to the Speech Communication Association/American Forensics Association Convention, Annandale, VA.

Preston, Jr., C. T. (1992). Extemporaneous speaking and impromptu speaking: A system for differentiating benefits and practical applications. *The National Forensic Journal*, *X* (Spring), 19-32.

Reynolds, C. L., & Fay, M. (1987). Instructional practices: Competitive impromptu speaking. *The National Forensic Journal*, *V*(Fall), 81-94.

Sellnow, D. D. (2003). *Public Speaking: A Process Approach*. Media ed. Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth.

Verderber, R. F., and Verderber, K. S. *Communicate!* (11th ed.) 2005. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Whitaker Long, B. (1977). "Evaluating Performed Literature." In E.M. Doyler & V.H. Floyd (Eds.) *Studies in Interpretation Volume II*. (pp. 267-282). Amsterdam, the Netherlands: Rodopi NV.

Whitaker Long, B. (1991). Performance criticism and questions of value. *Text & Performance Quarterly. 11*(2), 106.

Yordon, J.E. (2002). *Roles in Interpretation* 5th ed. Boston: McGraw Hill.

Zarefsky, D. (2007). *Strategic Public Speaking: A Handbook*. 4th ed. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.