Justifying Forensic Programs to Administrators: An experiential education opportunity

*Deanna D. Sellnow**

Introduction

While most communication educators value forensic programs as a unique and vital part of an undergraduate degree in Speech Communication, it seems we are continually being asked to justify those programs to administrators. Many scholars have addressed this need and formulated a variety of rationales for forensic programs grounded in numerous different theoretical and pedagogical frameworks (Aden, 1991; Boileau, 1990; Buys and Copeland, 1985; Carbone, 1989; Faules, Rieke and Rhodes, 1976; Greenstreet, 1989; Harris, 1989; Harris, Jr., Kropp and Rosenthal, 1986; Hindman, Shackelford and Schlottach, 1991; Klopf, 1991; Rice, 1991; Underberg, 1989). This paper is another attempt to justify the inherent value of forensic programs via yet another pedagogical approach.

With the advent of the 1990's, a new "buzz word" has found its way into educational research. That buzz word is experiential education. Experiential education is grounded in the notion that students learn most effectively when they are afforded the opportunity to apply theories in real-life contexts (Goodland, 1984; Greene, 1988; Hutchings and Wutzdorff, 1988; Lightfoot, 1983; O'Keefe, 1986). This concept of connecting theoretical classroom learning to real-life experiences provides an excellent justificatory framework for forensic programs as an educational opportunity.

The goal of this paper, then, is to offer a forensic program rationale grounded in experiential education theory. To achieve this goal, three major tenets of experiential education are summarized, and a description of how forensic programs may help students reach each goal is offered. These three major tenets include: (1) connecting

---

**National Forensic Journal*, XI (Winter 1994), pp. 1-14.

DEANNA D. SELLNOW is Assistant Professor in the Department of Communication, North Dakota State University, Fargo, ND 58105.

theoretical knowledge to real-life experiences; (2) valuing and fostering different "ways of knowing" and (3) encouraging life-long learning. While many useful rationales for forensics already exist and several do address specific educational objectives which can be met via forensic programs, none are grounded in experiential education as it is described in educational research today. Thus, by using contemporary educational jargon to form the theoretical foundation, this paper extends existing research in ways which may, perhaps, influence those administrators who have yet to be convinced of the worth of forensic programs as an important educational opportunity.

Connecting Theoretical Knowledge to Real-Life Experiences

Experiential education presumes a connection between theoretical knowledge and real-life experiences. Thus, knowledge of particular theoretical concepts is a prerequisite in order for experiential education to take place. Experiential education moves beyond theoretical comprehension, however, in that students must also apply these concepts to real-life experiences. Lightfoot (1983) explains:

> Schools need to provide asylum ... from the rugged demands of outside life at the same time that they must be interactive with it. The interaction is essential. Without the connection to life beyond school, most students would find the school's rituals empty. It is this connection that motivates them [the students]. (p. 322)

The concept behind experiential education is not new. It actually appeared in Dewey's (1938) progressive educational philosophy: "One consideration stands out clearly when education is conceived in terms of experience. Anything which can be called a study, whether mathematics, arithmetic, history, geography, or one of the natural sciences, must be derived from materials which at the outset fall within the scope of ordinary life experience" (p. 73).

O'Keefe (1986), a more contemporary proponent of experiential learning, explains it as "communicative decentering" in contrast to the self-centered communication which often results from the passive learning which takes place in many classrooms. She also expands Lightfoot's earlier contentions that connected learning motivates students, to suggest further that critical thinking is enhanced when students apply new communicative strategies to the true contexts of their lives.

Finally, Greene (1988) also conveys the need to move education beyond the classroom to the real contexts of human lives:

> There is an analogy here for the passivity and the disinterest that prevent discoveries in classrooms, that discourage inquiries, that make even reading seem irrelevant. It is not simply a matter of motivation or interest. In this context, we can call it a question having to do with freedom or, perhaps, the absence of freedom in our schools....[In any field], even among the exact sciences, a heightened curiosity may accompany the growth of feelings of connection between human hands and minds and the objects of study, whether they are rocks or stars or memory cores. (pp. 124-128)

Hence, experiential education takes place when students do more than merely understand theoretical concepts presented in the classroom. Experiential learning takes place when students are also able to see the connection between these ideas and the real world outside the classroom and can effectively apply these concepts to their own lives beyond the classroom.

How, then, do forensic programs foster this kind of learning? McBath (1975) stated that "forensics is an educational activity primarily concerned with using an argumentative perspective in examining problems and communicating with people" (p. 11). By taking the theories beyond the classroom, forensic students are able to develop the content of a speech through careful organization, style and delivery. Initially, students competing in forensics use the fundamental skills they learned in public speaking courses to create a coherent and logically structured speech. Moreover, forensic competitors who compete in an event such as communication analysis must: first, conceptualize a theory and, second, use that theory to analyze an artifact. Ideally, the artifact is one of their own choosing—one which matters to them in some way. It is not an "assignment" which they must complete to fulfill the requirements for a particular course. Rather, it is an idea or an artifact which, for the competitor, seems relevant to real life in some way. Moreover, competitors are expected to also show their audiences how and why this idea or artifact is important to them in their lives. Further, these audiences are comprised of people who are not merely other classroom students who may feel obligated to listen as a part of the expectations of the course. Rather, they are compelled to listen only when the speaker addresses listener relevance successfully by linking the content of the speech to actual life experience.

Persuasive, informative, impromptu and extemporaneous speaking all require students to offer a thesis statement substantiated by various forms of support. These students are able to take the concepts of speech construction learned in the formal classroom into a new situation. Typically, these speeches focus on contemporary issues which are prominent in the news media at the time. Thus, regardless of the event, students are analyzing real-life issues and taking their analyses outside the college classroom walls. Moreover, students competing in the limited preparation events (extemporaneous and impromptu) are expected to recall basic public speaking fundamentals in a limited amount of time. This opportunity to practice spontaneity is a technique which may also help these students connect classroom knowledge to life experience whey they eventually enter and compete in the business world, as well (Sellnow, Littlefield and Sellnow, 1992, p. 2).

Audience analysis is another communication concept which forensic programs may foster by moving beyond the formal classroom setting. To be successful, forensic competitors must analyze every audience they face. The audiences vary from region to region of the country, from school to school within a region, and from room to room at a given tournament. While it is possible to talk about audience analysis in a college classroom, the fact remains that every speech a student presents in a particular course is in front of the same group: a group often comprised of individuals very similar demographically and even psychologically to the speaker. The forensic program affords students the opportunity to move beyond the classroom setting to apply these audience analysis skills with their judges and peers.

Many concepts and skills centered around nonverbal communication are also embellished by forensic programs in terms of moving out of the classroom and connecting those concepts and skills to real-life experiences. Although students are taught about nonverbal communication and reading audience feedback in the formal classroom, students may often feel coerced into offering supportive feedback to other speakers in the college classroom (i.e., those who don't support their classmates while giving speeches may be judged more harshly when it's their turn to speak). While some of this coercion may still be felt in a round of forensic competition, it is usually less dramatic. In fact, some unethical contestants may even attempt to "throw a speaker off" with their nonverbal behavior during a speech. Thus, forensic competitors are able to practice reading nonverbal feedback in a closer-to-real-life setting than the college classroom.

Forensic students are also offered an opportunity to apply nonverbal delivery skills beyond the classroom experience. Again, while paralanguage, kinesics, chronemics, proxemics, and object language are discussed in the college classroom, it can be difficult, if not impossible, to convince students to actually employ them during their classroom speeches. Too often, intelligibility and poise suffice for attaining a passing grade. In the competitive forensic setting, however, intelligibility alone is not likely to get a speaker very far. These competitors may feel challenged to actually apply these concepts in a context where such application can make the difference between success and failure. Forensic competitors who employ these concepts effectively in their delivery of public address and oral interpretation events are usually justly rewarded.

Connecting theoretical knowledge to real-life experiences is one major tenet of experiential education. Forensic programs offer students the opportunity to take many of the theories and skills learned in the college classroom into a real- (or at least quasi-real-) life setting. Nonetheless, mastery of such theories and skills rewards competitors by means other than letter grades. Further, the theories and skills which are often left untried in the college classroom must be employed effectively in the forensic setting if one is to attain success.

Valuing and Fostering Diverse "Ways of Knowing"

Experiential learning allows students to move beyond the classroom walls which tend to isolate and fragment learning to, instead, consider learning as it occurs throughout their daily lives. According to experiential education theory, learning does not come about only in the traditional classroom setting (if it does so at all in such a setting). Moreover, people learn about the world around them via encounters with numerous symbol systems. O'Keefe (1986) claims, for example, that speakers' ideas continue to develop spontaneously even as they engage in [daily] conversation. She explains that "speaking aloud releases peripheral information that the mind has absorbed, and allows the speaker to express him or herself more fully" (p. 9). Oliver and Gershman (1989) support experiential education in that it helps foster ontological knowing. They write that experiential learning moves beyond modernity (i.e., fragmented classroom knowledge) to allow ontological knowing to emerge: "It is a connection first only felt, then expressed as art, drama, later as story and only later as science or philosophy" (p. 26). They argue further that education must search for ways to reconstrue and experience the world with greater balance and interrelatedness:

> Integration includes the deliberate search for occasions in which ontological understanding informs and relates to technical knowing. It includes activities that enrich a broad range of metaphorical sensibilities. (p. 29)

Greene (1988) expounds further about this inherent need to challenge students to consider multiple perspectives and diverse ways of knowing: "Education for freedom must clearly focus on the range of human intelligences, the multiple languages and symbol systems available for ordering experience and making sense of the lived world" (p. 125). She argues that real learning can only take place when we are able to interpret the world through many perceptual lenses:

> Reflectiveness, even logical thinking remain important; but the point of cognitive development is not to gain an increasingly complete grasp of abstract principles. It is to interpret from as many vantage points as possible lived experience, the ways there are of being in the world. (p. 120)

For teachers, then, valuing other ways of knowing becomes valuing students' ways of knowing:

> Rather than posing dilemmas to students or presenting models of expertise, the caring teacher tries to look through students' eyes to struggle with them as subjects in search of their own projects, their own ways of making sense of the world. (p. 120)

Experiential education contends that deeper, richer and more meaningful learning takes place when the subject matter is considered from a variety of vantage points. To do so, it is paramount that we move beyond encouraging only "technical knowing" and "fragmented knowledge" which typify many classroom experiences to also foster other "ways of knowing" as both significant and relevant.

In the broadest sense, forensic programs as a whole provide different ways of knowing for participants. Students are usually free to select the event in which they choose to participate. Regardless of whether students choose to prepare public speaking events or oral interpretation events, they may view the topic or literature via their individual way of knowing.

More specifically, in public speaking events, students often choose their topics and frameworks for analysis themselves. Hence, each competitor views a specific issue in a unique or "different" way. In oral interpretation events, ideas are presented through the presentation of literature. One way in which competitors convey meaning of a selection is through the introduction. Koeppel and Morman (1991) write, "There is no absolute, inherent, 'real' meaning to the literature, but rather the performance is based on what the interpreter has experienced and is able to communicate through the introduction" (p. 146). Competing in these events affords students the opportunity to apply their own interpretations to a selection for competition. Of course, author intent is an important dimension in oral interpretation events. However, whenever a student interprets and then performs a work, his/her unique perspective embellishes the images and meanings intended by the author.

Further, oral interpretation events allow students to discuss important life matters via aesthetic storytelling, rather than informative or persuasive speaking. Hence, students communicate using a different symbol system albeit an art, drama, or story (Oliver and Gershman, 1989). These events help students learn to communicate ideas from multiple vantage points and multiple sensibilities. For example, a student presenting a Program Oral Interpretation about the aging process might select literature focused on growing old. By selecting various pieces of literature, the competitor uses multiple vantage points. Moreover, as the interpreter embellishes the written words with his/her delivery style, the audience may come to challenge their own preconceptions of aging. Thus, oral interpretation events may help competitors and audience members begin to value and respect different ways of knowing.

Competitors are also exposed to different ways of knowing when they watch and listen to other competitors interpreting their selections. Moreover, judges may offer additional points of view in their critiques of performances. Certainly, not all judges will offer insight into a literature reading based on one student performance. Forensic students, however, face a host of judges during a typical year of competition. Thus, they are afforded many opportunities to consider a variety of perspectives about the multiple meanings in a particular piece of literature, as well as a host of methods by which to interpret those meanings aloud. Again, the forensic competition opportunities in this regard extend beyond the few perspectives students may receive in a formal classroom (i.e., teacher perspective, performer perspective and peer perspective). Forensic competitors are fortunate in that they may consider their own perspectives, their coaches' perspectives, peers' perspectives and numerous judges' perspectives. Together, the competitor, the literature and the multiple audiences foster new and emergent ways of knowing throughout the forensic season (Koeppel and Morman, 1991).

Finally, forensic programs can bring these other "ways of knowing" back into the traditional classroom setting. Forensic competitors can be used to demonstrate effective tournament speaking structure, content and style for classroom students. Classroom students may gain new and different perspectives about various topics as they listen to their peers. They may even be persuaded to join the forensic program themselves. Forensic coaches and judges may also bring multiple "ways of knowing" back to the classrooms as they incorporate impromptu speeches, utilize different structural approaches, and embellish their expectations regarding delivery and style. Certainly, forensic programs fulfill the experiential education outcome of fostering diverse "ways of knowing" for participants. It is also exciting to realize that these competitors and coaches can also bring these diverse "ways of knowing" back into their classrooms.

Encouraging Life-long Learning

Experiential education is rooted in the process philosophy of education. This philosophy suggests that the primary role of education is to help students learn how to learn, rather than merely acquiring facts and procedures (Postman and Wingartner, 1969). Initially, life-long learning means fostering the ability in students to ask questions and seek possible answers to those questions throughout their lives. Greene (1988) expounds upon this need to encourage inquiry:

> In the classroom opened to possibility and at once concerned with inquiry, critiques must be developed that uncover what masquerade as neutral frameworks.... Teachers, like their students, have to learn to love the questions, as they come to realize that there can be no final agreements or answers, no final commensurability. (p. 134)

Again, Dewey's (1938) concepts of progressive education developed over fifty years ago actually address these same kinds of critical thinking issues. When discussing questioning and inquiry skills, he cautions teachers about their role in nurturing inquiry skills on the part of students: "The way [to nurture inquiry] is, first, for the teacher to be intelligently aware of the capacities, needs and past experiences of those under instruction, and, secondly, to allow the suggestion made to develop into a plan and project by means of further suggestions.. . . The plan, in other words, is a co-operation, not a dictation" (pp. 71-72).

Fostering life-long learning goes beyond learning to question and even beyond integrating curriculum between classroom and life experience. Fostering life-long learning also includes integration between fragmented subjects. Whitehead (1922), for example, explains that "science and poetry have the same root in human nature." And, in Hendley's (1986) words, "The teaching of science, then, should contain both a hard element of factual information, laboratory work, and experimentation leading to the attainment of exact knowledge based on first-hand information and a soft element which encourages the imaginative and fanciful impulses" (pp. 94-95). In order to prepare young people for life-long learning, education must initially rid itself of the "misguided idea of the functional separateness of education and schooling from the broader culture" (Oliver and Gershman, 1989, p. 31). Subsequently, we can begin to:

> Work toward a sophisticated theory of deep knowing and being that will raise the most general questions about the quality and destiny of the human species, of nature, and of human participation in nature. It is at this point, for example, that the distinc-

> tion between the various academic disciplines must break down. For the study of such questions requires that we be able to move between and interrelate the fields of physics, biology, religion, history, and poetry in a single conversation. (p. 30)

Fostering life-long learning, then, centers around the notion of encouraging students to question even those ideas which seem factual or neutral. In order to do so in ways which can move beyond the formative years into adulthood, we must offer educational opportunities where students link theory to real-life experiences, consider and value other "ways of knowing," and integrate concepts which too often remain separated by auricular lines. In terms of experiential education, it is then and only then that students will learn how to learn, and learn to question the world around them in ways which can benefit them and those around them throughout their lives as students and as adults.

In terms of forensics, Klopf (1982) writes, "The student develops skill in reflexive thinking and reasoning, and learns to perceive the fallacious and shallow reasoning of others" (p. 8). Once competitors learn to accept diverse ways of knowing, they can extend their thinking to decipher fallacious reasoning from supported and grounded reasoning. In impromptu speaking, for example, students are expected to think critically about a quotation, apply it to their lives, and express their interpretation of it based on sound and grounded reasons. In extemporaneous speaking, students must answer a question focused on some contemporary real-life event, develop their arguments based on grounded reasons, and support those reasons with evidence. Students competing in these events must foster their critical thinking skills in order to succeed. Further, competitors who listen to their peers in these events may also learn to value different views and interpretations of the world. Thus, not only may students be developing their critical thinking skills by competing in these events, as audience members they may also be enhancing their ability to tolerate and value the ideas of others (Klopf, 1982).

Also, as audience members, forensic competitors may begin to develop critical listening skills which they will take with them in their careers (Cox, 1991; Sellnow, Littlefield and Sellnow, 1992). Critical listening occurs when a message is perceived, understood, evaluated and finally assigned worth (Wolvin and Coakley, 1992).

Typically, in order to be successful, the ideas offered by speakers must be relatively diverse. When listening to those speeches, audience members are afforded opportunities to employ and develop their critical thinking and listening skills: skills which future employers will be seeking in their employees and skills which will add to the life of communities, as well (Greynolds, 1989).

Finally, developing these skills is likely to benefit competitors later in their lives; however, participation in forensics programs may also benefit competitors and their communities while they are still competing. For example, some programs hold "talkathons" to raise money for community service programs while making the program and talented competitors more visible to the public (Sellnow, 1992). Speakers Bureaus are yet another means by which to offer a service to various community organizations while promoting the forensics program and offering practical speaking experience (not to mention possible employment connections) to the speakers. In sum, forensic programs can be a vibrant model for meeting the experiential education outcomes for life-long learning.

Conclusions

Forensics is an activity brimming with potential benefits to those who choose to become involved in it. Its inherent value in the education of students, however, is not always observed by those administrators outside the communication discipline. By linking forensic programs to several major tenets of experiential education, perhaps some administrators who have not previously appreciated forensic education but do support experiential learning will begin to realize the inherent educational value of forensic programs. Simply put, if experiential learning is real learning, and forensic competition can be explained via experiential learning terminology, then forensics education is inherently real learning, as well.

This paper addresses three major tenets of experiential learning: (1) connecting theoretical knowledge to real-life experiences, (2) valuing and fostering different "ways of knowing," and (3) encouraging life-long learning. Each tenet was embellished with examples as to how forensics serves to foster it. Forensics is certainly an activity. But it is much more than that. Forensics is an activity which promotes experiential learning and has been doing so long before experiential education became an educational buzz word. Now that education theory has caught up with us, so to speak, let's use their own words to justify our existence. Communication educators have realized the inherent value of forensics programs for a long time. Finally, an ideal opportunity has emerged to help administrators comprehend the educational merit, too. Let's take it!

References

Aden, R. (1991). Reconsidering the laboratory metaphor. Forensics as a liberal art. National Forensic Journal, 9 (2), pp. 125-140.

Boileau, D. (1990). The role of department chair as forensic promoter. National Forensic Journal. 8 (1), pp. 87-94.

Buys, W. & Copeland, J. (1985). The need for a speech activity program. Non-Competitive Speech Activities. Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.

Carbone, R. (1989). Forensics: our contribution to education. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, San Francisco, CA.

Cox, E. (1991). Assessing and repositioning an educational function of collegiate debate. Proceedings to the 1991 Professional Development Conference: Commitment to Forensic Education: The Challenge to the Twenty-First Century, pp. 139-159.

Dewey, J. (1938). Experience and education. New York: Collier Books.

Faules, Rieke, Rhodes (1976). Directing forensics: Contest and debate speaking. (2d ed.). Denver, CO: Morton Publishing Co.

Goodland, J. (1984). A place called school: Prospects for the future. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Greene, M. (1988). The dialectic of freedom. New York: Teachers College Press.

Greenstreet, R. (1989). Earning support for individual events programs. Paper presented at the First Developmental conference on Individual Events, Denver, CO.

Greynolds, M. (1989). PKA-Opportunities for campus and community enhancement. Proceedings of the Developmental Conference on the Future Role of Pi Kappa Delta in the Forensic Communitv, pp. 33-40.

Harris, E. (1989). Strategies to enhance university support for individual events programs. Paper presented at the First Developmental conference on Individual Events, Denver, CO.

Harris, Jr., Kropp and Rosenthal. (1986). The tournament as laboratory: Implications for forensic research. National Forensic Journal, 4 (1), pp. 13-22.

Hendley, B. (1986). Dewey, Russell, Whitehead: Philosophers as educators. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Hindman, M., Shackelford, J. and Schlottach, K. (1991). Working forensics: A competitor's guide. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company.

Hutchings, P. and Wutzdorff, A. (Eds.). (1988). Knowing and doing: Learning through experience. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Klopf, D. (1982). The forensic program. Coaching and Directing Forensics. Skokie, IL: National Textbook Company.

Koeppel, L. and Morman, M. (1991). Oral interpretation events and argument: Forensic discourse or aesthetic entertainment? National Forensic Journal, 9 (2), pp. 141-153.

Lightfoot, S. (1983). The good high school. New York: Basic Books.

Littlefield, R. (1991). An assessment of university administrators: Do they value competitive debate and individual events programs? National Forensic Journal, 9 (2), pp. 87-96.

Littlefield, R. (1989). The cultivation of administrative and general support for individual events programs: Some practical suggestions. Paper presented at the First Developmental Conference on Individual Events, Denver, CO.

Littlefield, R. (1988). University administrators and forensics: What do the officials think about the activity? Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, New Orleans, LA.

McBath, J. (ed.). (1975). Forensics as communication: The argumentative perspective. Skokie, IL: The National Textbook Company.

MacMillan and Todd-Mancillas. (1991). An assessment of the value of individual events in forensics competition from students' perspectives. National Forensic Journal, 9 (1), pp. 1-18.

O'Keefe, V. (1986). Affecting critical thinking through speech.

Urbana, IL: ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills.

Oliver, D. and Gershman, K. (1989). Education, modernity, and fractured meaning: Toward a process theory of teaching and learning. New York: State University of New York Press.

Postman, N. and Weingartner, C. (1969). Teaching as a subversive activity. New York: Delacorte Press.

Rice, J. (1991). Pedagogical objectives for multiple-genre interpretation. National Forensic Journal, 9 (2), pp. 125-140.

Sellnow, T. (1992). The talkathon: A rewarding fund raising alternative. The Speech Communication Teacher, 6 (4), pp. 9-10.

Sellnow, T., Littlefield, R. and Sellnow, D. (1992). Evaluating internships and overcoming program concerns and constraints. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Chicago, IL.

Underberg, L. (1989). Creating a climate of support for forensics programs. Paper presented at the First Developmental Conference on Individual Events, Denver, CO.

Wolvin, A. and Coakley, C. (1992). Listening. (4th ed.). Dubuque, IA: William C. Brown.

Controlling Speech Anxiety: Academic recommendations and forensic applications

*Roberts. Littlefield, Timothy L. Sellnow and Mark A. Meister**

American, or western-style, colleges and universities traditionally rely upon out-of-context learning. That is, students acquire information and learn in a setting that is quite different from that in which the knowledge is applied (Klopf, 121). In speech communication, we ask students to learn and practice communication concepts and skills in a classroom and expect our students to use their speaking abilities in a variety of contexts. The forensic tournament is one of those contexts where speech concepts and skills can be applied. However, what is taught in the classroom and what is practiced in the laboratory setting or, in this case, the forensic tournament, may not always be aligned.

The tenets of communication that are applicable to forensics, and which are being addressed in the published textbooks and studies, are many, and our purpose is not to explore all of them in this essay. However, one is of particular interest to us because it deals with an experience that transcends both the in- and out-of-context situations: How should students deal with speech anxiety or the stresses associated with public speaking?

Students competing in forensic tournaments are concerned about variables that cause anxiety or stress. Littlefield and Sellnow (1992) identified these concerns through seven items contributing to anxiety levels at tournaments: Not enough time in the tournament schedule;

---

* *National Forensic Journal*, XI (Winter 1994), pp. 15-28.

ROBERT S. LITTLEFIELD is Associate Professor and Chair and **TIMOTHY L. SELLNOW** is Associate Professor, Department of Communication, North Dakota State University, Fargo, ND 58105, and **MARK A. MEISTER** is a doctoral student, Department of Communication Studies, University of Nebraska - Lincoln, Lincoln, NE 68588-0329.

reduction in the intake of nutritious foods and beverages; reduction in sleep; increased levels of stress; reduced opportunities for adequate exercise; increased chance for illness; and increased consumption of drugs (pp. 6-8). Some might suggest that the stressors identified affect, in negative ways, the performance levels of forensic students.

Because not all students who participate in forensics major in speech communication, they must rely upon their instructors to use the published communication and forensic studies, as well as the public speaking textbooks, for advice on how to deal with these factors causing anxiety in the forensic tournament context. Realistically, coming from all majors as they do, students often rely on Introduction to Public Speaking courses as their primary vehicle for being exposed to, and learning how to deal with, speech anxiety. Our focus in this paper is to explore the question: What advice are we giving our forensic students about dealing with speech anxiety? In other words, do the published texts and studies being used in the speech communication classroom adequately address the needs of students when they go into the laboratory setting of forensic tournaments?

In our search to find the sources of information available for forensic students with speech anxiety questions or problems, we chose to examine three sources: Published studies in speech communication; selected textbooks used in the basic speech course; and selected studies and textbooks in forensics. Our purpose in reviewing these sources was to determine what information is provided about dealing with speech anxiety and/or stress and to postulate if we are providing the information in our classrooms that is needed by our students when dealing with the out-of-context experiences they encounter at forensic tournaments. The following discussion provides an overview of selected perspectives.

Selected Published Studies in Speech Communication

Weissberg and Lamb (1977) provided a reasonable way of categorizing speech anxiety research that is useful today. They claimed that speech anxiety research focuses on how speech anxiety is measured, treated, and related to broader conceptualizations of anxiety (p. 27). In a general review of speech anxiety literature since 1977, Littlefield, et al. (1989), found that all three issues were still emphasized in the literature.

For examples, studies by Bourhis and Allen (1992), Behnke, Sawyer and King (1987), and Ayers (1986), serve to demonstrate a continued concern with how speech anxiety is defined and measured. Studies exploring the relationship of speech anxiety to broader conceptualizations of apprehension have focused largely on the distinction between situational and trait-like variables (Beatty & Friedland, 1990; Beatty, Falfantz & Kuwabara, 1989; Beatty, 1988). Of greatest use in this study is the research regarding recommended treatments for speech anxiety.

The suggestions for treating speech anxiety vary. Connel and Borden (1987) concluded that desensitization and cognitive modification, two treatment techniques that receive a great deal of attention in the literature, are useful for speech instructors attempting to reduce speech anxiety in their students. Littlefield and Sellnow (1987) argued that further research be conducted regarding the use of self-disclosure to reduce speech anxiety in the public speaking class. Ayers (1988) offers support for the use of positive thinking, in the form of visualization, to cope with speech anxiety. He found that students who were trained to use visualization had lower speech anxiety during an informative speech than those who were not trained. Booth-Butterfield (1988) indicated that state or situational anxiety may be reduced "by offering strong rewards for communication in class and, especially, public settings (p. 222). He also suggested that the avoidance of students with low speech anxiety and the state anxiety of students with high communication anxiety can be reduced by allowing students to work with acquaintances. Pelias and Pelias (1988) found that, in the basic performance of literature course, students with low communication apprehension may perceive themselves as apprehensive, but still rate the performance experience positively, conversely, students with high speech anxiety are more likely to see the apprehension as an incapacitating problem that makes performing literature a tense and unrewarding experience. Two additional studies addressed issues related to the treatment of speech anxiety. Pelias (1989) examined twenty-five public speaking textbooks to determine how the subject of communication apprehension was addressed in contemporary texts. She found that none of the information in these texts was inaccurate. However, much of it was dated and derived from non-academic sources. Booth-Butterfield and

Cottone (1991) argued that efforts to reduce speech anxiety in students may border on psychological treatment. Consequently, they suggested that a code of ethics ought to be created for the treatment of students with speech anxiety by people in the communication discipline.

Summary

The communication education literature offers a variety of means for coping with speech anxiety. Desensitization and self-disclosure would be difficult coping strategies for contestants to implement in a competitive setting. Conversely, positive thinking, visualization and rewards are all potential means for reducing anxiety in forensic competition. As Table 1 illustrates, all of these strategies deal with stress, attitude and relaxation. The problem for competitors, as Littlefield and Sellnow (1992) suggested, is that the tournament context intensifies stress and limited opportunities for relaxation.

All of the research described here is limited to a stress that is generated by the contestant's thoughts related to delivering a speech. What is lacking in this literature is advice for coping with speech anxiety that is stimulated by variables within the competitive context. Visualization, for example, will do little to overcome the anxiety associated with a compressed schedule. Similarly, desensitization is not likely to help a competitor cope with deficiencies in nutrition or sleep. In short, the communication education literature does little to provide insight on the impact of the competitive setting on speech anxiety.

Table 1
Specific Speech Apprehension Strategies
Addressed in Communication Education Research: 1986-1992

Topics	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Desensitization	X					X	X	
Self-Disclosure	X					X	X	
Visualization	X					X	X	
Rewards	X					X	X	

Legend: l=stress; 2=exercise; 3=illness; 4=drugs; 5=sleep; 6=attitude; 7=relaxation; 8=nutrition

Selected Public Speaking Textbooks

Textbooks used in the basic speech course are an additional source of information about measuring speech anxiety, identifying strategies for coping with anxiety, and relating speech anxiety to other communication situations. Through a review of thirteen textbooks for topics related to speech anxiety or apprehension, eight general categories reflecting strategies for coping with speech anxiety were identified: Sleep, relaxation, attitude, nutrition, stress, exercise, illness and drugs. These categories can be characterized, operationally, as follows:

Sleep: Getting a good night's sleep before the speaking experience to be physically and mentally prepared.

Attitude: A positive change in attitude, or "speaking with a sense of confidence" in speech when preparing and delivering a speech.

Relaxation: In order to reduce stress, breathing exercises are offered as strategies to gain composure.

Nutrition: Eating a balanced diet and eating lightly prior to the speaking experience helps to prepare the speaker physically.

Stress: Anxiety or apprehension that is felt before and during the speaking experience.

Exercise: In order to reduce stress, a regular exercise routine may help speakers to cope with speech anxiety.

Illness: Extreme levels of anxiety or stress may lead to minor illnesses, such as upset stomach or headaches.

Drugs: Including caffeine-filled beverages, alcohol and any mind-altering substances are not recommended during speech preparation or presentation.

These categories are consistent with the study conducted by Littlefield and Sellnow (1992) which examined the behaviors of participants in forensic tournament competition (see Table 2).

Stress. All of the thirteen texts mentioned stress as a major factor felt before and during the speaking experience. These feelings of nervousness were described in all texts as a major factor inhibiting creativity in speech building and delivery. Therefore, many of the texts offered suggestions under the heading of "speaking confidently" (Logue, et al., 1992; Brilhart, et al., 1992). Furthermore, texts identified stress with such labels as anxiety (Koch, 1992; Beebe and Beebe, 1992; Hanna and Gibson, 1992; and Ayers and Miller, 1990), "nervousness" (Osbomand Osborn, 1991; Verderber, 1991; Lucas, 1992), and "stage fright" (Samovar and Mills, 1992; Gronbeck, et al., 1990; Makay, 1992). Each text offered suggestions to help students cope with the stresses inherent in public speaking.

Table 2

Topics Addresed** in **Basic Course Textbooks

Text	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
1		X			X			
2		X	X		X			
3	X	X	X		X			
4		X			X			
5		X			X			
6		X			X			
7	X		X		X		X	
8		X			X			
9	X	X			X			
10	X	X		X	X			X
11		X			X			
12			X		X			
13		X			X			

Legend:

	Texts		*Categories*
1	Ayers and Miller	A	Sleep
2	Beebe and Beebe	B	Attitude
3	Brilhart, et al.	C	Relaxation
4	Devito	D	Nutrition
5	Gronbeck, et al.	E	Stress
6	Hanna and Gibson	F	Exercise
7	Koch	G	Illness
8	Logue, et al.	H	Drugs
9	Lucas		
10	Makay		
11	Osborn and Osborn		
12	Samovar and Mills		
13	Verderber		

Attitude. A change in attitude reduces speech anxiety. The speaker's attitude about her/himself, the speaking situation, and the audience often results in negative opinions about public speaking (Logue, et al., 1992). Several texts suggested that developing confidence in front of a group is necessary for developing a positive attitude. By incorporating positive "self-talk" techniques, a student develops a positive mental attitude (Gronbeck, et al., 1990). Other texts suggested visualizing a positive speech experience, resulting in speaker confidence (Hanna and Gibson, 1992; Ayers and Miller, 1990). Scheduling a speech at a time that is psychologically best for the speaker helps a student to gain confidence (Verderber, 1991).

Relaxation. Reducing stress often results in a strong, coherent speech performance. Breathing exercises were offered as a strategy to help gain composure (Koch, 1992; Samovar and Mills, 1992; Brilhart, 1992; Beebe and Beebe, 1992; Devito, 1990). Deep, regular diaphragmatic breathing exercises induce a state of relaxation prior to the speech (Samovar and Mills, 1992).

Sleep. In order to reduce apprehension, a speaker needs to be physically able and mentally sharp. "Vocal delivery demands a quick and confident mind. Many texts suggest that getting a good night's sleep before the speaking experience prepares the speaker physically and mentally (Koch, 1992; Brilhart, etal., 1992; Makay, 1992; Lucas, 1992). Staying up until early hours in the morning writing the speech and expecting to speak effectively is not a recommended speaking strategy (Lucas, 1992).

Nutrition. Another way a speaker can be mentally and physically prepared to give an effective speech is to eat a balanced diet. Makay (1992) suggests the importance of a balanced diet in speech preparation. It was further suggested that eating lightly before a speech was better than eating a big meal, because after a big meal most people feel lethargic (Makay, 1992).

Illness. Extreme levels of anxiety or stress may lead to minor illnesses, such as upset stomachs or headaches. Some students become so overwhelmed prior to the speaking experience they become physically ill. A speaker's physical health may be affected by stage fright (Koch, 1992) resulting in an inability to give the speech.

Drugs. In order to maintain metal sharpness, Makay (1992) suggests avoiding caffeine-filled beverages, alcohol and any mind-altering substances prior to the speech.

Summary

Most of the selected textbooks focused on how a positive mental attitude can reduce speech anxiety. The textbook authors generally agreed that a student needs to be physically and mentally prepared for the speaking experience. According to some texts, this meant preparing physically be getting a good night's sleep before the speaking experience, inducing relaxation by breathing deeply, eating a balanced diet, and abstaining from drug usage. These recommendations apply to the forensic context.

Forensic Textbooks and Published Studies

Prior to Hindman, Shackelford and Schlottach's textbook entitled, Working Forensics: A Competitor's Guide (1991), few suggestions have been available for coaches and students seeking ways to deal with speech anxiety. Perhaps more problematic for the discipline is the absence of advice based upon research. The Buys (1965) series on oratory, extemporaneous speaking and other individual events provided few anecdotal suggestions, such as: "be on time, be prepared, be well-dressed and be well-rested" (Extemporaneous Speaking. 1965, p. 27). These pamphlets were later copyrighted as The Creative Speaking Series (1972). However, they did not include any additional insight into speech anxiety for forensic students or their coaches. Klopf (1982) did not address the topic of speech anxiety in his textbook, Coaching & Directing Forensics. Faules, Rieke and Rhodes (1976) suggested ways in which a coach could keep a good perspective about forensics. However, as far as helping students to recognize and overcome speech anxiety, this textbook was also lacking. Specialized coaching textbooks, such as Forensic Tournaments: Planning and Administration (Goodnight and Zarefsky, 1980) excluded the topic of speech anxiety. Buys and Copeland (1985) came at the topic of speech anxiety from the vantage point of non-competitive speech activities. In their concise way, they offered the argument that self-confidence can be build through positive experiences. Littlefield and Littlefield (1987) furthered the position that building positive experiences is essential when working with children in elementary school programs.

In contrast to these earlier forensic texts, Hindman, Shackelford and Schlottach (1991) included two major sections in their book dealing with the topic of speech anxiety. In a section entitled, "Survival Skills," topics such as time management, learning to accept criticism and learning how to manage anxiety through breathing exercises, concentration and relaxation are developed (pp. 24-39). Later in the book, they focused more specifically on the previously identified topics related to speech anxiety: getting enough sleep, using "self-talk" to relax, keeping a positive attitude about winning, eating the right foods, developing mental toughness to deal with the stress of competition, exercising regularly, getting medical help when sick and staying away from sick colleagues, and avoiding drugs (pp. 300-309). Based upon the practical experience of its authors, the weakness of this textbook is the absence of theory-based research to support their suggestions.

The topic of dealing with speech anxiety has been absent from most of the published research in forensic journals. Dean's (1990) review of articles dealing with forensic pedagogy suggested that while debate has a greater emphasis in the literature, pedagogy "directed towards individual events is especially lacking" (29). Of the twenty-seven articles on individual events cited, all were event-specific and dealt with coaching strategies; none identified ways for dealing with speech anxiety. Logue and Shea (1990) used the Developmental Conferences in Individual Events, along with the work of other forensic scholars, to justify the forensic activity as an educational laboratory for the discipline. However, through their review, they found that coaching strategies, rather than speech anxiety and other basic issues facing the student moving from classroom to tournament, were the focus of published research.

Summary

While most speech communication educators and forensic coaches would agree that learning to cope with speech anxiety is an important hurdle for students to cross, forensic textbooks and studies have not specifically addressed the topic. Adding to this is the reliance upon anecdotal suggestions, rather than theory, as a basis for the limited information available on speech anxiety.

Suggestions for Further Research

The communication education literature provides some useful information for students seeking help in reducing their speech anxiety in forensic competition. However, the literature does not address the manifestations of stress we identified in the competitive context. While we, as forensic educators, may understand the unique relationship between forensics and the classroom, we need to show others how our activity provides an application of theory to a variety of contexts, particularly when dealing with situation-based anxiety. Sprague (1993) supports this when she suggests: "Every discipline needs a vital branch of pedagogical and curricular scholarship informed by the best theoretical work in that discipline" (p. 119). Hence, this suggests that forensics might well contribute to the communication discipline on topics such as competitive speaking and stress. Further research regarding the situational anxiety fostered by forensic tournaments is essential if we, as forensic coaches and administrators, want to justify our activity as a laboratory experience for our students.

We expected that the textbooks used in basic public speaking courses would address the topic of speech anxiety. While the selected textbooks we reviewed did present suggestions about dealing with speech anxiety, there were several situational constraints identified in the forensic context that were not addressed; specifically, the need for nutrition, exercise, healthful behaviors and the avoidance of drugs.

The absence of suggestions for dealing with speech anxiety in forensic textbooks and published studies may be based, in part, upon the assumption that this topic is being dealt with elsewhere. However, as this review suggests, we cannot depend upon the communication education literature or public speaking textbooks as they are currently being written to provide the insights and solutions needed in the competitive out-of-context learning environment. Zarefsky (1993) discussed the damaging judgments from those outside the communication discipline resulting from the propensity of those in our field to ignore the unifying concepts that connect our teaching and research efforts. This criticism rightly may be applied to forensics because coaches and teachers give the appearance of not having used research to focus on the communication concepts that cross a variety of contexts — from the classroom to the tournament—dealing with speech anxiety and stress. We need to seek out common interests and concerns and share our findings in the field. What applies in one context may provide insight for another. The research being done in the area of speech anxiety should not be confined to the classroom. The study of the out-of-context learning environment found in the classroom can play a useful role in identifying variables affecting speech anxiety. However, the classroom environment should not lay exclusive claim as the center of research on this subject. Because forensics takes place in a specialized context, coaches and teachers can provide insight into how to teach students to deal with stress in competition. As this study suggests, forensic educators must take on the responsibility for investigating the relationship between speech anxiety and the contest setting. In doing so, we may better serve our students as they leave the confines of the classroom and seek to communicate in a more competitive context.

References

Ayers, J. (1986). Perceptions of speaking ability: An explanation for stage fright. Communication Education, 35, 275-287.

Ayers, J. (1988). Coping with speech anxiety: The power of positive thinking. Communication Education, 37, 289-296.

Ayers, J. & Miller, J. (1990). Effective public speaking. Dubuque, IA: Wm. C. Brown.

Beatty, M.J. (1988). Increasing students' choice-making consistency: The effect of decision rule use training. Communication Education, 37, 95-105.

Beatty, M.J., Belfantz, G.L. & Kuwabara, A.Y. (1989). Trait-like qualities of selected variables assumed to be transient causes of performance state anxiety. Communication Education, 39, 142-147.

Beck, R.A. (1972). Radio speaking. Skokie, IL: National Textbook Co.

Beebe, S.A. & Beebe, S.J. (1991). Public speaking: An audience-centered approach. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Behnke, R.R., Sawyer, C.R. & Kind, RE. (1987). The communication of public speaking anxiety. Communication Education, 37, 138-141.

Booth-Butterfield, S. (1988). Instructional interventions for reducing situational anxiety and avoidance. Communication Education, 40, 214-223.

Bourhis, J. & Allen, M. (1992). Meta-analysis of the relationship between communication apprehension and cognitive performance. Communication Education, 41, 68-76.

Brilhart, J.K., Bourhis, J.S., Miley, B.R. & Berquist, C.A. (1992). Practical public speaking. New York: Harper Collins.

Buys, W.E. (1965). Extemporaneous speaking. Skokie, IL: National Textbook Co.

Buys, W.E. & Copeland, J.M. (1985). Non-competitive speech activities, revised by J.W. Eisenhardt. Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Co.

Connell, S.H. & Borden, G.A. (1987). Incorporating treatment for communication apprehension into oral communication courses. Communication Education, 36, 56-61.

Dean, K.W. (1990). Encouraging forensics pedagogy. National Forensic Journal, 8 (2), 29-36.

Devito, J.A. (1990). The elements of public speaking (4th ed.). New York: Harper & Row.

Faules, D.F., Rieke, R.D., Rhodes, J. (1976). Directing forensics. 2nd ed. Denver, CO: Morton Publishing Co.

Goodnight, G.T. & Zarefsky, D. (1980). Forensic tournaments: Planning and administration. Skokie, IL: National Textbook Co.

Gronbeck, B.E., McKerrow, R.E., Ehninger, D. & Monroe, A.H. (1990). Principles and types of speech communication (11th ed.). Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.

Hanna, M.S. & Gibson, J.W. (1992). Public speaking for personal success (3d ed.). Dubuque, IA: Wm. C. Brown.

Hindman, M., Shackelford, J. & Schlottach, K. (1991). Working forensics: A competitor's guide. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Co.

Klopf, D.W. (1982). Coaching & directing forensics. Skokie, IL: National Textbook Co.

Klopf, D.W. (1991). Intercultural encounters: The fundamentals of intercultural communication (2d ed.). Englewood, CO: Morton Publishing Co.

Koch, A. (1992). Speaking with a purpose (2d ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Littlefield, R.S., Beekie, B.R., Holm, L.S., Holm, T.T., Larson, J.B. & Paulson, K.J. (1989). Conducting communication education research: An investigation of speech anxiety research and speech fundamentals texts. Paper presented at the Red River Valley Student Communication Conference, Fargo, ND.

Littlefield, R.S. & Littlefield, K.M. (1988). KIDSPEAK: An innovative activity program for children. Paper presented at the 16th Regional Plains Conference of the International Reading Association, Fargo, ND.

Littlefield, R.S. & Sellnow, T.L. (1987). The use of self-disclosure as a means for reducing stage-fright in beginning speakers. Communication Education, 36, 62-64.

Littlefield, R.S. & Sellnow, T.L. (1992). Assessing competition and stress: The perceived effect of tournament atmosphere on students and coaches. National Forensic Journal, 10,1-10.

Logue, B.J. & Shea, B.C. (1990). Individual events research: A review and criticism. National Forensic Journal, 8,17-27.

Logue, CM., Freshley, D.L., Gruner, C.R. & Huseman, R.C. (1992). Briefly speaking: A guide to public speaking in college and career (4th ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Lucas, S.E. (1992). The art of public speaking. New York: McGraw Hill.

Makay, J.J. (1992). Public speaking: Theory into practice. Orlando, FL: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Miller, M.H. (1972). Special occasion speeches. Skokie, IL: National Textbook Co.

Osborn, M. & Osborn, S. (1991). Public speaking (2d ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Pelias, M.H. (1989). Communication apprehension in basic public speaking texts: An examination of contemporary textbooks. Communication Education, 38, 41-53.

Pelias, M.H. & Pelias, R.J. (1988). Communication apprehension in the basic course in performance of literature. Communication Education, 37, 118-126.

Samovar, L.A. & Mills, J. (1992). Oral communication: Message and response (8th ed.). Dubuque, IA: Wm. C. Brown.

Scott, R.L. (1965, reprinted 1972). Oratory. Skokie, IL: National Textbook Co.

Sprague, J. (1993). Retrieving the research agenda for communication education: Asking the pedagogical questions that are embarrassments to theory. Communication Education, 42, 106-122.

Verderber, R.F. (1991). The challenge of effective speaking (8th ed.V Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Weissberg, M. & Lamb, D. (1987). Comparative effects of cognitive modification, systematic desensitization, and speech preparation in the reduction of speech and general anxiety. Communication Anxiety, 44, 27-36.

Zarefsky, D. (1993). Does intellectual diversity always serve us well? Spectra, 29, 2.

Fostering Greater Analysis in Rhetorical Criticism: A re-examination of Whately's views on rhetoric

*Alan Givens**

When Richard Whately published his ***Elements of Rhetoric*** in 1828, he brought the legal notions of presumption and burden of proof into the rhetorical realm. However, in competitive rhetorical criticism, these two notions are rarely, if ever, addressed. Instead, Whately's notions have been incorporated into modern argumentation and debate theory. As a result, the modern forensicator often views presumption and the burden of proof as items which only apply to debate. This view seems short-sighted.

Rhetorical critics frequently ignore the larger contexts surrounding a particular artifact (Murphy, 1988). That is, many critics do not refer to the "backdrop" of an artifact in their analyses — those social norms, governmental bodies and/or other institutions which shape the artifact and which can affect the rhetorical success/failure of the artifact. As a result, these competitors never explore — or explain — the relation of their analyses to the "larger picture." Presumption, as something which belongs to "existing institutions," may illuminate some of these larger contexts. That is, by identifying the institutions (e.g., societal norms or governmental bodies) surrounding a particular artifact, the competitor may achieve a better understanding of the artifact. Identification of these institutions may also help students explain the rhetorical success or failure of a given artifact. In short, the notions of presumption and burden of proof may further the analyses of competitors. And, since many judges and coaches have noted the "need for more analysis" in rhetorical criticism (Levasseur & Dean, 1989), a re-examination of Whately's views on rhetoric is war-

---

* *National Forensic Journal,* XI (Winter 1994), pp. 29-36.

ALAN GIVENS is a Master's student in the Department of Communication Studies, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Lincoln, NE 68588.

ranted. Therefore, in the next few pages I will examine Whately's notions of presumption and burden of proof in relation to competitive rhetorical criticism. I will first review previous discussions on the need for more analysis in rhetorical criticism. Second, I will examine Whately's views on rhetoric. Finally, I will describe how Whately's views may be incorporated into rhetorical criticism.

The need for more analysis

The National Forensic Association National Championship Tournament offers the following rules for rhetorical criticism:

> Contestants will deliver an original critical analysis of any significant rhetorical artifact. The speaker should limit the quotation of, paraphrasing of, or summary of the analyzed artifact to a minimum. Any legitimate critical methodology is permissible as long as it serves to open up the artifact for the audience. The speech must be delivered from memory. Maximum 10 minutes. (NFA Tournament Invitation, 1992)

The crucial part of the NFA description, for the purposes of this paper, is that students should deliver an "original critical analysis" (emphasis added). The development of this critical perspective is, according to Andrews (1989), the first objective of rhetorical criticism. The ability to critically analyze an artifact forms the basis of the event itself.

Given Andrews' observation, a review of a critical perspective is warranted. Thonssen, Baird and Braden (1981) offer this insight: "In short, the critical process presupposes a search for the larger, the comprehensive view of a problem" (p. 12). Therefore, based upon the preceding passages, one may say that good rhetorical critics (competitors) should somehow address the larger, comprehensive issues surrounding their particular artifacts. However, this insight into the larger view is often lacking in rhetorical criticism (Murphy, 1988). Students frequently delve into the mechanics of the speech before they fully understand what they are doing.

This lack of insight, however, is not necessarily the fault of the competitor. Many students are briefed on the event, then expected to construct a speech without any specific guidance. Yet, perhaps the strongest justification for rhetorical criticism—both competitive and academic — is to gain insight into the nature of rhetoric. Without reference to these larger contexts, such insight is limited. As a result, the critical perspective is never fully achieved. This lack of insight has been reflected in recent discussions on the need for more analysis in competitive criticism.

Murphy (1988, 1983) suggests that the event's emphasis on methodology is partly responsible for students' lack of analysis. As he puts it, "Judges want an introduction to the method, an explanation of the method, an application of the method, and methodological conclusions" (1988, p. 4). As a result, competitors make the methodology, not the artifact, the focus of their speeches. Murphy then argues that focusing on the "text" of the artifact circumvents the methodological emphasis and, thus, results in greater analysis.

While Murphy's suggestion is a step in the right direction, it does not go far enough. Focusing on the text itself may not offer enough insight into the larger, comprehensive issues surrounding an artifact. Many students only identify two implications: one concerning the artifact which they analyzed, and one concerning the rhetorical method they used. Implications concerning the larger contexts surrounding the artifact are rarely addressed. Attention to the context of the artifact, however, does provide such insight. As Andrews (1989) notes: "Out of the context, the text itself emerges, a text crafted to meet the imperatives of the context and, ultimately, to modify the context" (p. 180). An understanding of the larger, more comprehensive issues surrounding an artifact fosters a deeper understanding of the artifact itself. Therefore, a critical analysis should address the contexts surrounding a given artifact. Judges, in fact, frequently comment on "the historical/background information about the artifacts) studied" (Dean & Benoit, 1984, p. 103).

Context offers rhetorical critics what Brockriede offered critics in 1974 — the possibility for greater analysis. However, context may offer critics, especially beginning critics, something which Brockriede does not: clearer, better understanding. Brockriede demonstrates how argumentative rhetorical criticism

> requires a comparison between the experience under scrutiny and a more general concept or category system. Such concepts or category systems may already be in existence and ready to be used, or they may be invented by the critic. The critic says, in effect, that a general idea about rhetoric can illuminate a con-

crete rhetorical experience he [sic] is studying. (1974, p. 170)

While Brockriede's claim is correct, reference to other, more general rhetorical concepts and/or category systems may only lead the critic to more rhetorical terms and "jargon" — not a deeper understanding of the artifact. Instead of referring forensic students to other rhetorical terms, concepts or category systems, coaches need to insure that their students fully understand what they are analyzing. Not only can such understanding result in greater analysis, it may also result in a more rewarding educational experience for the competitor.

Context is, therefore, crucial to a critical analysis; indeed, it can determine how the artifact itself is analyzed. Context may also offer a clearer understanding of an artifact than other approaches. Due to the time restrictions of the event, however, such contexts cannot be fully explored within the speech itself. Thus, a framework for understanding the contexts of an artifact is needed. Such a framework can be found in Richard Whately's ***Elements of Rhetoric.***

Whatelv's views on rhetoric

Several concepts from Whately's ***Elements of Rhetoric*** are crucial to rhetorical criticism: his definition of rhetoric, his discussion of presumption and burden of proof, and his view on the invention and arranging of arguments. Whately, in ***Elements,*** identifies rhetoric as "argumentative composition." His definition achieves a middle ground between those who consider rhetoric to be all "Composition in Prose" and those who limit rhetoric to "Persuasive Speaking." It is important to note, however, that Whately's definition is still compatible with those who consider rhetoric to be limited to persuasive speaking. He states, "it is evident that *Argument* must be, in most cases at least, the basis of Persuasion" (p. 6).

Whately's treatment of presumption and burden of proof marks the first time that these traditionally legal principles are incorporated into rhetorical thought. Whately clarifies the two concepts:

> According to the most correct use of the term, a "Presumption" in favour of any supposition, means. . . such a *pre-occupation* of the ground, as implies that it must stand good till some sufficient reason is adduced against it; in short, that the *Burden of proof* 'lies on the side of him who would dispute it. (p. 112)

According to Whately, the speaker should decide and/or recognize at the beginning of each case where the presumption and the burden of proof lie. To help identify which side can claim presumption, Whately suggest that there is "a Presumption in favour of every existing institution" (p. 114). It therefore follows that the burden of proof "lies within him who proposes an alteration [in the existing institution]" (p. 114).

Whately's view of rhetoric as argumentative composition, then, is supported by his notion that rhetoric consists of the art of inventing and arranging arguments. Identifying presumption and burden of proof can help guide the invention and arrangement of these arguments (with invention being the discovery of ideas and/or arguments, and arrangement being the organization of those ideas and/or arguments). With these notions in mind, let us turn to how Whately's views on rhetoric may provide a framework for greater analysis in competitive rhetorical criticism.

Incorporating Whatelv's views into competitive criticism

Whately suggests that a speaker, at the beginning of each case, should determine where the presumption and burden of proof lie. That is, the student would begin his/her analysis—before the speech is ever written—by identifying the contexts surrounding the rhetorical artifact. Whately himself provides the importance of determining presumption: "on the determination of this question the whole character of a discussion will often very much depend" (p. 113). It is important for the rhetorical critic to determine presumption and burden of proof at the beginning of his/her analysis because this will shape the very nature of his/her criticism. Or, in Whately's terms, determining presumption will affect the invention and arrangement of the arguments used by the rhetorical critic. For example, the contexts surrounding an artifact may affect the choice of method. That is, a student may initially want to use a particular method for analysis. After examining the contexts of the artifact, however, the student may find that another method is more appropriate. Such choices are far easier to make before the speech is written than afterward.

On a more practical level, the student may identify the contexts surrounding an artifact via question-and-answer sessions. Such sessions may be conducted with or without a coach. The first few questions should relate directly to presumption and burden of proof. For example, "With what organization is this artifact affiliated?" and "What myths and/or societal norms are incorporated into the artifact?" and "With what institutions is the artifact in conflict?" Questions can then proceed to the rhetorical success or failure of the artifact. Why did the artifact fail? What existing institutions affected the success or failure? Is the success of the artifact long-term or short term? Answers to these and similar questions can help the student fully understand the artifact before the speech is ever written. Answers can also help students brainstorm possible implications. More importantly, these sessions can help direct the student to the most appropriate method for analysis.

Some coaches may claim that using these sessions to select an appropriate method results in "an artifact that is applied to the method, rather than a method that is applied to the artifact." This claim is flawed for four reasons. First, these sessions only *direct* students to a method; that method still needs to be applied. That application can involve many steps and/or levels of analysis — intricacies which are unique to that method. The background/backdrop questions of these sessions are exactly that: background/backdrop. The resulting answers develop the contexts of the artifact; they do not construct pedantic ratios, chart clusters, or whatever becomes the method for analyzing the text of the artifact. Second, students are required (or virtually required) to justify their choice of method. The answers obtained in these question sessions help formulate that justification. Third, many students find that the methods with which they began the season are not "working." Thus, they have to change methods during mid-season, then write and memorize a new speech. As these sessions can help students find the most appropriate method, students can better avoid changing horses in mid-stream, saving them time and energy. Finally, as beginning critics are often unfamiliar with the format of the event, these critics should also fully understand what they will be analyzing before they attempt to analyze it. Applying a method to an artifact is usually easier when one first understands the artifact itself and the contexts surrounding it.

At this point, it is important to recognize that not all rhetorical criticisms will be able to effectively use presumption/burden of proof. Or, more specifically, some artifacts lend themselves to an inclusion of presumption/burden of proof more than others. However, every competitor should still try to determine the presumptive factors (i.e., the "existing institutions") surrounding an artifact. Whether or not presumption is identified in the actual analysis is irrelevant. Determining presumption and burden of proof is critical to comptetitive criticism, as it provides a starting point for the critic's analysis. By determining presumption, the student identifies the backdrop against which the analysis itself may begin.

By identifying the presumptive factors surrounding a given artifact, these factors may then be addressed in the student's analysis. For example, implications may be drawin concerning the contexts surrounding the artifact. Many of these political, social and moral contexts will continue to exist. As a result, the student achieves a greater understanding of the artifact and of rhetoric itself. This greater overall understanding will lead to greater analysis, enhance the educational value of the event, and may well result in greater competitive success.

Whately's discussion of presumption and burden of proof, therefore, provides a framework for understanding the contexts of a given artifact. Such a framework may foster a higher level of analysis and a greater understanding of the contexts in which rhetoric continues to operate. For these reasons, then, it seems that Whately's discussion of presumption and burden of proof are not items which only apply to competitive debate. Rather, these notions are also well suited to competitive rhetorical criticism.

References

Andrews, J.R. (1989). "Wise skepticism": On the education of a young critic. Communication Education, 38,178-183.

Brockriede, W. (1974). Rhetorical criticism as argument. The Quarterly Journal of Speech, 60, 165-174.

Dean, K.W. and Benoit, W.L. (1984). Acategorical content analysis of rhetorical criticism ballots. National Forensic Journal, 2, 99-104.

Levasseur, D.G. and Dean, K.W. (1989). A defense of questions in rhetorical critical criticism. National Forensic Journal, 7, 151-158.

Murphy, J.M. (1983). Rhetorical criticism as argument: A need for social criticism. In G. Ziegelmueller & J. Rhodes (eds.). Argument in Transitition: Proceedings of the Third Summer Conference on Argumentation (pp. 918-926). Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association.

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

National Forensics Association National Championship Tournament Invitation (1992).

Thonssen, L., Baird, AC. & Braden, W.W. (1981). Speech criticism (2nd ed.) Malabar, FL: Robert E. Krieger.

Whately, R. (1963). Elements of rhetoric. (D. Ehninger, Ed.). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University. (Original work published 1828).

Considering the Role of the Physically Challenged Student in Individual Events Competition

*David L. Kosloski**

Henry David Thoreau once wrote "He [or she] is the best sailor who can steer within the fewest points of the wind, and exact a motive power out of the greatest obstacles." For the physically challenged student in today's society, the removal of many structural and administrative obstacles to education is affording unprecedented opportunity. Yet why, in a world where the term "disability" is no longer politically correct and the label "handicapped" has become a pejorative, do barriers persist that work to discourage the physically challenged student from participating in activities laden with traditional guidelines and evaluative measures? This paper is an attempt to consider the role of the physically challenged student in collegiate individual events competition by examining the results of a preliminary survey distributed to a sampling of forensic administrators concerning the presence, recruitment, and evaluation of such students in programs nationwide. Through a discussion of the current findings and an assessment of the value of future research in the area, it is hoped that the present study will foster self-reflection by the forensic community regarding the amount and quality of space it has created for the physically challenged performer.

Rationale

In his thought-provoking 1991 article, Bob Derryberry reminds us that "we who believe in the activity of forensics must continually ask important questions, queries which examine our programs and give direction for existence in the following decades" (p. 19). Research regarding the role of the physically challenged student in fo-

---

* *National Forensic Journal,* XI (Winter 1994), pp. 37-46.

DAVID L. KOSLOSKI is a Doctoral student in the Department of Speech Communication, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, IL 61801.

rensics is greatly warranted as our community continues to struggle with two significant issues in the nineties: (1) charges that many programs exhibit an elitism that discourages widespread participation, and (2) ever-increasing budget and administrative cut-backs.

Derryberry (1991) argues that "the total forensic program must remain sensitive to the problem of access in admission, theory and practice" (p. 25). He concurs with Swanson (1989) that tournament qualifications, judging idiosyncrasies, entry-level criteria, and specialized style of presentation have created barriers that hinder total student involvement. Limited access to forensic programs can also be attributed to a number of practices that discourage an open philosophy: programs that merely replicate secondary training by requiring high school experience as a qualifying prerequisite, tournaments that force beginners to compete against other very experienced or "seasoned" performers (Derryberry, 1991), and ill-developed recruiting strategies that often focus only on students from relatively educated homes (Sillars and Zarefsky, 1975) while failing to adequately emphasize the educational merits of forensics to the broader incoming student population (Twohy, 1988). Programs that emphasize prior experience and established talent over simple desire significantly reduce the pool of students from which new competitors are drawn, and this includes the physically challenged.

Perhaps more detrimental to the future of forensics are widespread budget and administrative cutbacks. Derryberry (1991) asserts that in some cases, programs that focus on a very limited number of speakers actually reinforce administrative expectations and contribute to the cycle of inadequate budgeting. Indeed, Garner (1991) maintains that in response to trends affecting higher education, such as increased enrollments, dwindling financial resources and administrative apathy, forensic educators will need to be more sensitive to planning and meeting goals and claims about the value of forensic competition. "It could be in future years that the forensic community's liaison with the community-at-large [will] be a critical source of validation for the existence of forensic competition" (p. 3). Forensic educators, however, must recognize that the community-at-large is a diverse population. Data taken from the most recent National Post Secondary Student Aid Study indicates, for example, that of the approximately 12.5 million post-secondary students enrolled at the time of the study, 1.3 million reported that they had a handicap (1987). Given the goals set by Garner (1991) and others for the future of forensics, these demographics underscore the need for research that examines the relationship between the forensic community and the physically challenged members of the broader student population.

Procedure

To begin assessing the extent to which physically challenged students are involved in collegiate individual events and identify issues concerning that involvement, a preliminary study was conducted in February 1993. A total of 113 questionnaires were mailed to the directors of Individual Events Programs at a sampling of institutions nationwide taken from a mailing list drawn from the membership directories of the National Forensic and American Forensic Associations. Fifty-two questionnaires were returned and tabulated, making the return rate 46%.

The questionnaire sought to obtain demographic information about the respondent, the location of the institution and the individual events program including national association memberships, size of student involvement and number of physically challenged students competing. In all, questionnaires were returned from 25 states with multiple responses from Illinois (8), California (5), and Michigan (5). Fifteen schools indicated membership with both NFA and AFA, 17 schools with NFA only, 14 schools with AFA only, and six schools with Phi Rho Pi only. The number of students per program averaged 16, with eight schools reporting at least one physically challenged student among the participants.

In addition, a combination of both closed and open-ended questions were developed which asked for the following information: the nature of each physically challenged student's disability, recruiting choices, concerns as a coach regarding the needs of physically challenged students, concerns as a judge regarding the evaluation of the physically challenged performer, and suggestions/opinions regarding the role of such students in collegiate forensics (see Appendix A).

Results and Discussion

As coaches and judges consider the role of the physically challenged student in individual events competition, their answers betray a host of disparate reactions which raise key issues for the forensic community in general. Indeed, and analysis of the current survey reveals that, while attitudes toward diversity in forensics are positive, the logistics governing its achievement are decidedly undermining.

For example, at face value those answers to the question "Would you/do you consider physically challenged students when recruiting?" were encouraging. Virtually 100% of the respondents indicated that whether they recruit or not each would encourage the involvement of a physically challenged student. Most cited "talent and desire" as the only criteria for participation in individual events programs. Yet responses to the subsequent question "Do you have any concerns as a coach about working with a physically challenged student in your school program?" reveal valid anxieties about the realities of achieving such diversity. Forty-six percent of those responding expressed concerns about the presence of physically challenged competitors, including general mobility, the costs of providing adequate transportation for wheelchair-bound students, and building accessibility. One respondent wrote: ". . . our squad room and our communication building are currently inaccessible — they both have <u>many</u> stairs and no ramps or elevators."

Concerns also emerge regarding the visually impaired student. One respondent wrote:

> [He] has tried a number of methods of transportation from building to building at tournaments. He asks other competitors and his teammates. He have tried to get volunteers to come along and help, but neither [he] nor the team can afford to hire someone. . .His teammates. . .are running to rounds and they don't have time to help him. So he does his best to get around. . .He has been lost in basements, been misdirected by students and maintenance staff to the wrong buildings, and fallen into a hole being dug out for a basement on campus.

Though many coaches may welcome the opportunity to work with a physically challenged student, the reality of the financial costs associated may often be prohibitive. As one respondent lamented:

> My only concern would be if special needs . . . meant that we could need to spend a disproportionate share of medium-sized-to-low budget on one person.

There are also emotional costs. Lack of training for coaches presents real anxiety. While virtually all of the respondents indicated a willingness to work with a physically challenged student, only 19% indicated having any previous experience coaching such a competitor. Of the 81% indicating no experience with a physically challenged competitor, some reported anxiety over the lack of information about the particular disability, procedures in the event of an emergency, and liability concerning the transportation of certain physically challenged students. One coach noted:

> I'm more anxious about diabetics — timing for meals is so [crucial] at tournaments. . . After she graduated, one of my former debaters died from diabetic imbalance because she passed out alone in her apartment. I'd hate to have to worry about diabetes or epilepsy because there's the potential for unexpected trauma.

The disparity between the willingness to coach a physically challenged competitor and the realities of doing so has the potential to greatly undermine the ability of many programs to welcome a physically challenged competitor. The survey reveals that, while most coaches are receptive to working with the physically challenged, personal and financial concerns may prove subversive. My own experiences coaching physically challenged students (one with Tourette's Syndrome and the other with cerebral palsy), coupled with those detailed by other coaches, underscores this concern. One coach remarked:

> Coaching [this student] is very difficult. I wasn't trained to work with the [visually impaired]. . . How do you teach a person who has never seen a gesture what it is that a judge means when they tell him to relax and use his body? . . [Impromptu has been a challenge because] I have had to devise aural ways to time . . [and] in some situations … the quotations are so long that [he] can't remember them and they are not in Braille so that he can read them.

The reality is that a coach's anxiety may alienate or discourage the physically challenged competitor from continuing in the program. Whether implicit or explicit, frustration, anger and impatience can be clearly expressed in the most guarded of moments. Wrote one respondent: "We have never had a physically challenged student remain long enough to go to a tournament."

Results of the questionnaire indicate that the student-to-student relations are also an issue. Given the question "Do you have any concerns about how other members of your team would respond to a physically challenged student?", 11% of the respondents indicated some concerns for interpersonal relations between physically challenged and non-challenged teammates. Most coaches cited room assignments on overnight trips, reluctance to assist team members in dressing, packing and other personal matters, and general negative team feedback as valid concerns. One respondent's experience gives credibility to these anxieties:

> At first, students acted very strangely toward [him]. They thought they needed to worry about him all the time and then they were embarrassed when he "imposed on other teams" ... Over time, though, I think the whole team has matured about the whole thing.

Not only do directors have concerns in their roles as coach, but also in their roles as critic. Of the 52 respondents, 87% indicated that they had judged a physically challenged student during an individual events competition. Many cited the nature of the student's challenge as including wheelchair confinement, cerebral palsy, visual, hearing or vocal impairment, missing or artificial limbs, epilepsy, Tourette's Syndrome, and muscular dystrophy. In responding to the question "Do you have concerns as a judge about evaluating a physically challenged student in competition?", 75% of all respondents indicated that they had no concerns while 25% expressed some concern.

though the majority of the respondents expressed confidence in their ability to evaluate a physically challenged competitor, those with doubts give rise to some salient issues. Consider these responses:

> [I am concerned] that judges subconsciously grant to challenged students more lee-way or credit for performance beyond whatever allowances must be taken into account— the "sympathy" ballot.

> In interpretive events, if a student's voice is somehow [impaired], it becomes very difficult to apply the usual judgment criteria.

> I wonder if I'm being too hard or too forgiving for some individuals. Take persuasion, delivery is obviously an important element and, everything being equal, a . . . (traditional) student

who has free movement and the ability to stand would have some advantage (nonverbally) over a student confined to a wheelchair. Frustration over how to apply standard criteria to the physically challenged stuent in a competitive round can create anxiety that can undermine the best of intentions. Even those with confidence in their evaluative skills may encounter specific situations in which certain standards of evaluation come into question. Respondents remarked:

> Judging a student with cerebral palsy was a challenge because it was difficult to tell how much control he had over his motor skills. Thus, I was hesitant... to comment on his excessive use of hand gestures.
>
> In the case of a hearing-impaired student, the only category not applicable is vocal quality — should it count that much? ... [At] a tournament the student "signed" the speech, while the interpreter sat, in the audience, back-to-the-judge, and [vocally] interpreted the speech.
>
> It was never a problem for me because I am very open-minded. However, I must admit when I judged the girl in Duo Interpretation doing "Children of a Lesser God" and found out she was really deaf, I felt a bit cheated. I felt perhaps she had an unfair advantage.

Questions such as these relfect the concern many forensic critics have as they grapple with the duties of evaluating the physically challenged competitor. The answers, while never clear-cut, must be carefully crafted to protect both the integrity and value of the forensic experience.

Conclusion

While this paper has raised several issues regarding the participation of the physically challenged student in individual events competition, it is not meant to be prescriptive beyond its call for closer scrutiny. Yet respondents to the current survey echo each other in their call for some form of action. Most suggest that education is the key, while others argue that broader criteria and standards must be established for the critic to employ. To address these concerns, further reaearch must be done regarding the number of physically challenged students currently participating in all programs nationwide, the cost and availability of equipment for adequate transportation, attitudes of physically challenged students toward other competitors, coaches and critics (including response to evaluative feedback), and vice-versa, as well as other concerns of the physically challenged competitor. In addition, the forensics community must challenge itself to address the concerns of critics (both lay and experienced) regarding the application of evaluative criteria during competition. With ever-increasing budget cuts and ever-decreasing administrative support, the forensics community must secure its future by working to reflect within its ranks the diversity and uniqueness of the community it serves.

While no one questions the willingness of the forensics community to work with physically challenged competitors, the disparity between the will to become involved and the realities of becoming involved cannot be dismissed. Yet as many who have had the privilege of working with a physically challenged competitor can attest, commitment to each and every student rarely goes unrewarded.

Appendix A

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
Department of Speech Communication

As the director of the individual events program at the University of Illinois, I want to gather information concerning the role of the physically challenged student in various individual events programs across the country. Please take a few minutes to help by answering the questions below. Your responses will be kept strictly confidential, so please be as honest as possible. I have provided a self-addressed, stamped envelope for your convenience. Please return this survey by March 1, 1993.

Section A. General Administrative Questions

1. Your name: ____
   College /University: _________________________________
   Address: ____

Phone number: ______________________________________

2. Are you the Director of Forensics at your institution (yes/no)?
   If not, what title do you hold? _________________________
   How long have you held this position? _________________
3. With which national forensic association(s) is your program affiliated? AFA/NFA/Other ___________________________
4. _Approximately how many students participate in your individual events program? _____________________________

Section B. General Questionnaire

1. Do you currently have any students competing on your team that are physically challenged (i.e.: visually impaired, hearing impaired, wheelchair-bound, etc.) and, if so, how many?

2. Please describe the nature of <u>each</u> student's disability.

3. Would you/do you consider physically challenged students when recruiting (yes/no)?
   Why or why not?

4. Do you have any concerns as a coach about working with a physically challenged student in your school program (i.e.: transportation, funding, mobility, special equipment, meals, funding, etc.)? Please discuss these specifically; include any anecdotes that might help to illustrate (use additional paper if necessary).

5. Do you have any concerns about how other members of your team would respond to a physically challenged student (i.e.: positive or negative attitudes toward special needs, traveling, sleeping arrangements, etc.)? Please discuss these specifically; include any anecdotes that might be useful in illustrating (use additional paper if necessary).

6. Have you judged a physically challenged student in individual events competition (yes/no)?
   Please describe the nature of the disability of each student you have judged.

7. Do you have concerns as a judge about evaluating a physi-

cally challenged student in competition (i.e.: applying uniform standards of evaluation, timing, use of manuscript/interpretation book, vocal characteristics, etc.)? Please discuss each concern specifically; include any anecdotes to help illustrate (use additional paper if necessary).

8. Do you have any suggestions for how any of the above concerns might be resolved (i.e.: personal experiences, research ideas, examples, etc.)? Please be specific in your discussion (use additional paper if necessary).

9. What other opinions/concerns/ideas do you have for considering the role of the physically challenged student in individual events competition? Can you think of any other information that might be useful on this subject that has not been covered by this survey?

Thank you for your time. The information you have provided will be used in a paper to be presented at the Central/Southern joint conference in Lexington, KY in April.

References

Derryberry, B.R. (1991). The nature of the "total" forensic program: The 1990s and beyond. National Forensic Journal, IX, 19-29.

Garner, P. (1991). Taking Forensics into the Community: Prospects for the Future. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Atlanta.

Sillars, M.O. and Zarefsky, D. (1975). Future goals and roles of forensics. In James H. McBath (ed.), Forensics and Communication, pp. 83-93. Skokie, IL: National Textbook.

Swanson, D. (1989). The future role of Pi Kappa Delta: Our challenge for the year 2000 and beyond. The Forensic, 74,13-23.

Twohy, K.M. (1988). Developing the Recruiting/Public Relations Potential of the Forensic Program. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, New Orleans.

Coaching Intercollegiate Debate and Raising a Family: An analysis of perspectives from women in the trenches

*Ann Burnett Pettus and Mary Ann Danielson**

The year 1992 was dubbed the "Year of the Woman" in politics, and yet, what many individuals will remember most from 1992 may not be the elections, but the Murphy Brown-Dan Quayle debate. While the issue of working mothers has been dramatically pushed to the forefront of the socio-political arena, what the media elite have neglected to explicitly point out is that the issue of working mothers is neither new nor insignificant.

Women have been working outside the home for more than one hundred years. Approximately 20% of American women were working outside the home at the turn of the century (Matthews & Rodin, 1989). The percentage rose during World War II as women replaced men in war-related industries. Since that time, the number of working women has continued to grow. As of 1988, 55.9% of women, or 53.9 million, were in the civilian work force (p. 1389). It is further estimated that by 1995, 81% of all women aged 25-34 will be in the labor force (Chusmir et al., 1990, p. 167). Therefore, while the issue of working women is not a new concept, the issue of working women and men and family life is a relatively new one — one that has received a great deal of attention in the last several years. While studies suggest that most working women are satisfied with maintaining a job and a family, the issue has never been raised in the context of intercollegiate debate. This field presents a unique situation for women

---

* *National Forensic Journal,* XI (Winter 1994), pp. 47-53.

ANN BURNETT PETTUS is Assistant Professor and Director of Forensics, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, NE 68588, and **MARY ANN DANIELSON** is Instructor and Director of Forensics, Creighton University, Omaha, NE 68178.

debate coaches in that the travel and time demands of the activity are different from the demands of a "regular" faculty member or a typical nine-to-five job.[1] Thus, the purpose of this essay is to examine the practicality of having a family and coaching intercollegiate debate.

Review of Literature

There is a great deal of current literature regarding the issue of working mothers. For example, Chester (1990) suggests that women base their decisions regarding work and raising children on external factors (such as job-related factors and husbands' attitudes) and individual characteristics (values and beliefs about work and raising children).

Once the decision to work has been made, Moore (1986) argues that women face three potential conflicts: time-based (limited resource of time), strain-based (strain related to one role may "spill over" to another role), and behavior-based (different sets of behaviors for each role may be incompatible). Richter (1990) elaborates that a working mother faces two types of transitions: planned (these occur regularly in the morning when going to work and in the evening when going home), and interposed (which occur when a person is in one domain and deals with issues from another domain). Such conflicts and transitions are problematic for working mothers, but Apter (1985) argues that women need to accept such conflicts; "these conflicts are not shams, or the result of a conspiracy, but the result of complex needs within a society that has not as yet attuned itself to these particular complex needs" (pp. 59-60).

Despite conflicts, however, scholars have found that women can be satisfied with careers and family life, the that such balance takes work. For example, women administrators believe that the satisfaction of having children outweighs career problems, but that having a family can present problems and barriers to maintaining a career (Marshall & Jones, 1990). Stewart (1989) discovered that women who were satisfied with their decision to have a career and family had "flexible or adjustable work hours, supervisors' understanding and cooperation when emergencies arise or children are ill, job hours compatible with school and day care hours, adequate pay to obtain domestic help, and willingness of co-workers to help meet deadlines when emergencies arise" (p. 30). Richter (1990) concluded that women must seek solutions on three levels. On the organizational level, when women schedule meetings, they should keep stressful transition times open. On the family level, she encouraged equal participation with family chores; and, on the individual level, she argued that women should try to create a transition routine between work and home so that the transition is easier.

While the research about working mothers has provided interesting information regarding women's feelings about their dual roles, these studies have not examined women who have time commitments as rigorous as those of a debate coach. Additionally, women debate coaches do not have some of the options discussed in the above studies, such as maintaining hours which correspond with those of day care centers. Thus, research into the dual roles women play provides an important contribution to the academic and forensics communities, particularly in light of the trend toward more working mothers.

Method

Data in this study consist of narratives solicited from women with families who coach National Debate Tournament or Cross Examination Debate Association intercollegiate debate. These two types of debate (policy- and value-oriented) comprise the predominant forms of debate in college forensics. The women in the study were asked several general questions designed to promote a discussion of their impressions of coaching and motherhood. It should be noted that there are not many women in the debate community who fall into the coach/mother category; five narratives were returned, with an acceptance rate of sixty percent. In order to better analyze the narratives, a coder examined each sentence and/or group of sentences and placed them into categories. The categories which emerged include the advantages of coaching debate and raising a family, the disadvantages of coaching debate and raising a family, criteria by which such an arrangement works, and, finally, advice to those who are considering such choices. [2]

Results

Only one of the respondents argued that there are several advantages to coaching debate and raising children. The skills of organization and time management served her well as a mother and administrator. The children benefit from travel, and they benefit from having college students as friends. Finally, she felt that she was happier as a result of having both a career and children.

All of the respondents indicated that there are disadvantages to doing both jobs. One of the main disadvantages had to do with time problems. That is, the enormous amount of time required to coach debate and travel takes away time that a mother would like to spend with her children. This results in what one respondent called a "deadly dilemma," creating a continual feeling of guilt. Thus, coaches felt that they had to choose between extensive coaching and spending time at home — a perpetual dilemma which causes a great deal of stress. The second disadvantage dealt with role conflict. One coach write, "Traditional gender role indicates that a female should be submissive, non-assertive and noncompetitive... these qualities would not lend themselves to success in our field." Moore (1986) would agree; strain- and behavior-based conflicts could be very pronounced in the area of debate coaching.

Women debate coaches also argued that it was possible to coach debate and have a family under certain conditions. First, several of the coaches argued that one must assess the nature of the program in which one is working. If the program operates on a local or regional level, then the effect on the coach/mother is minimal. However, if the program is large-scale, the coach/mother must make good use of assistants and not travel as much. One respondent indicated that when she gave more responsibilities to graduate assistants, the competitors turned to her assistants more than her. This was a problem for her at first because it caused some jealousy, but she had to eventually accept the fact that the choice to spend time at home would make it harder to get close to her students. Another respondent said that she was not able to attend as many tournaments since having a baby. Thus, when a coach/mother is assessing the nature of the program, she must be prepared to accept different relationships with the squad as well as the decreased level of help that she can provide to the individual students.

The second factor that seems to be important to successfully balance coaching and motherhood is a supportive spouse. One respondent wrote, "unless your spouse truly understands and, more important, accepts the demands of coaching and the demands of parenthood, the combination may be impossible." Another wrote that she was fortunate that her husband was willing to take on the primary burdens of child care. Another indicated that raising a child and coaching debate was "close to impossible" because her husband's views of child raising and woman's career were "antiquated." This issue is one that Stewart (1989) does not address; thus, for successful debate coaching/mothering, support is essential.

Even though they were not asked this question, most of the respondents said that if they had to "do it all over again," they would. Further, they provided some advice to women who are thinking about balancing the two roles. First, they argued that the coach/mother must be creative in balancing the roles. One respondent wrote, "Give ... careful thought to your values and be guided by them when you are required to choose between the two roles (and you will be asked to do so). Realize that it is possible to succeed in both roles simultaneously, even on those days when you feel that you are succeeding in neither (and there will be those days). Know that more is expected of you than women in other fields and men in our own field (and be willing to accept that)." Richter (1990) would agree with her assessment and would argue that women coaches must examine the planned and interposed transitions in order to better deal with role conflicts.

Several respondents had a variety of advice regarding children. One coach argued that women should take their children to tournaments with them as long as possible, and they should establish an extended family. Two coaches recommended that women establish their coaching careers before having children. Finally, another respondent concluded that if one wants to coach and have children, "go for it. But be aware that it is not a road without holes. Still, like most highways, with a little forethought and constant planning, it can be maneuvered."

Conclusions

Being a debate coach and a mother is not an easy task. The respondents in this study generally are happy to be involved in both coaching and mothering, but the roles are challenging, perhaps more than the roles of the typical working mother. This study departs from general studies regarding the working mother by helping to explain the struggles of a unique, tough profession. As some women in this study point out, the already-tough expectations of debate coaching may be more demanding for a woman than a man, and, at the same time, the woman still has the burden of caring for her family. More importantly, the small number of women debate coaches should be of concern to the community, and this essay provides some initial insight into why more women may not be involved.

It could be argued that the small number of women to which this essay pertains makes the subject largely irrelevant. However, it is hoped that this study will provide the incentive for further investigation into the realm of intercollegiate debate; perhaps the challenge of these roles may help explain the male-dominated nature of our activity; perhaps male debate coaches with children share similar views. The issue of tenure is also a factor, since the women debate coaches in this study indicated that they have a difficult time balancing debate and family, let alone worry about publishing. The implications of this finding extend far beyond forensics in that the inability to secure tenure affects individual communication departments as well as the discipline as a whole.

In the future, if enough coaches are concerned with the problems encountered by these dual roles, maybe actions can be taken (such as cooperative child care at tournaments) that can make these role conflicts less severe. At the very least, those who are not involved in forensics ought to be aware of the extreme stress and strain caused by coaching and family life. As it stands now, however, to the disgust of Murphy Brown fans, intercollegiate debate might be labeled an "anti-family" activity and those choosing to pursue both roles will continue to be pushed to the limit.

Notes

[1]While there certainly are other occupations which require extensive hours, unusual shifts, or travel, our argument is that, in our discipline, forensics poses a unique burden upon those who are involved. At a minimum, forensics coaches are expected to meet with students during the day and usually at least one night a week to work on debate and speeches, then travel with them on weekends to tournaments.

In addition, we acknowledge that men who coach debate and have families face problems similar to the women who participated in this study. However, the purpose of this study was to examine the job of forensics director from the woman's point of view since the burden of child-raising traditionally falls upon the woman rather than the man. In addition, we argue that there are few women coaches, and it is time that their perspective is heard.

[2]Due to the small sample size, extensive content analysis was not necessary. Also, since only four categories emerged, determining an interrater reliability measure was unnecessary.

References

Apter, T. (1985). Why Women don't Have Wives: Professional Success and Motherhood. Great Britain: Macmillan.

Chester, N.J. (1990). Women with young children. In H. Y. Grossman and N.J. Chester (eds.). The Experience and Meaning of Work in Women's Lives. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 83-102.

Chusmir, L.H.; Moore, D.P. & Adams, J.S. (1990). Research on working women: A report card of 22 journals. Sex Roles. 22, 167-175.

Marshall, M.R. & Jones, C.H. (1990). Childbearing sequence and the career development of women administrators in higher education. Journal of College Student Development. 31. 531-537.

Matthews, K.A. & Rodin, J. (1989). Women's changing work roles. American Psychologist, 44,1389-1393.

Moore, L.L. (1986). Not as Far as You Think: The realities of working women. Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath and Company.

Richter, J. (1990). Crossing the boundaries between professional and private life. In H.Y. Grossman and N.J. Chester (eds.), 143-163.

Stewart, H.R. (1989). Job satisfaction of women in nontraditional occupations. Journal of Employment Counseling. 26. 26-34.

The authors wish to express their appreciation to the women debate coaches who provided narratives for this study.