Starting a Team

Larry Schnoor, Minnesota State University, Mankato, MN

James Kozinski, Minnesota State University, Mankato, MN

Abstract

Starting a forensic team at a College or University can be an extensive and challenging undertaking for a student or faculty member attracted to the idea. When determining the possibility of establishing a forensic program, research on the history of the previous programs at the institution must be done. Once it is determined that a program can be established, concerns should as budget, travel, and program direction need to be addressed. Students can certainly start a program, but faculty advising opens doors students are unable to unlock. Furthermore, if one student goes alone in the program's inception, the program ceases to exist when that student stops participating. Once a program has been established, its survival is dependent upon the continuance of recruiting new students. Team building, goal setting, and establishment of traditions are ways to insure program survival and success.

The College/University activity of forensics has numerous changes each year in its make-up of schools participating, schools no longer participating, and coaches—whether they are student or department supported programs. Our article is an attempt to provide information and suggestions to answer the question "how do I start a team?" The remarks are not meant to be prescriptive nor will they fit every situation, but rather they are to be a source of ideas, suggestions, and recommendations for individuals—be it a student or a faculty member, to check. We must all remember each school is different, each program is different, and there are numerous differences in the approach to forensic programs across the nation.

In attempting to get at the question, "How do I start a team?" it has to be recognized whether it be a student-run program or a faculty-run program supported by a department, a number of issues will be the same. Therefore we shall put forth a variety of things that need to be considered in either case, and in our remarks we will attempt to draw attention to the differences between student--faculty directed programs. Every year students arrive on a campus with an interest in forensics. Perhaps they had been on a high school team in either individual events or debate, or they have heard about forensics and have decided they want to participate. However, upon arrival, they discover that the school has no forensic program and they want to know what to do. We suggest the following:

1. First some research must and should be conducted. In this research the student should attempt to find answers to the following questions:

   A. Was there ever a forensic program at the school?

B. How successful was the program?
C. What was the scope of the program?
D. How was that program supported - funded?
E. Why was that program discontinued?
F. Was there a faculty member serving as the Director of Forensics?
G. What is the current position of the Department of Communication or the University/College in regard to a forensic program?
H. What are the requirements for any student organization - activity on campus?
I. If there was a previous forensic program, are there any alumni of that program that can be reached for help?
J. What were the travel patterns

2. Once the research has been completed, and material gained in answer to the above questions, the student can then begin to work on determining if it will be possible to establish a forensic program. These same questions need to be addressed by a Faculty person as well - in beginning a new program - or attempting to resurrect a program after a long absence.

It is not an easy task. It is not like the age-old idiom of "Oh lets put on a play!" and the neighborhood kids find an old barn and everyone pitches in and within a couple of weeks a play is presented to the parents or the guests at a summer camp or resort. If it were that easy, life would be wonderful. Let's say that the research indicated that no previous program has ever existed. In that case, our recommendation is that the student should first approach the Chair of the Speech or Communication Department to find out if the Department would be willing to serve as the sponsor and or support the program. If they are not interested, then the student could choose to approach some other Department to see if it would be interested in supporting the program. With the support of a Department on campus, the forensic program has a greater chance of success both in terms of being established but also of being continued in the long run. The Department may have reasons why it would or would not support the establishment of a program. The educational nature of the program is an issue that needs to be considered. The Department may not have any budget to support a faculty member to serve as the director of the program, but may be willing to have a graduate student or in some cases, even an undergraduate student, assume that responsibility.

Should it be discovered that no Department has an interest in being involved with the creation of a forensic program, the logical place to go would be the office that deals with student activities. Almost every College/University has an administrative unit that is concerned with student organizations that are extra-curricular or co-curricular in nature. The rules and regulations related to the formation of student organizations could be obtained as well as information related to the funding of such activities. Anyone interested in starting a forensic program naturally needs to be concerned with the recruitment of students to be on the

team. In some cases, there may be a single student that wants to have a forensic program. If that student is not able to find others, or not able to come up with support from a department or a student activity account, then the student, if they have enough financial means themselves, may make the decision to enter tournaments and "go it on his/her own." This is not recommended. This does not lead to the establishment of a forensic team nor a forensic program and once that student decides to stop or graduates, the school no longer has a forensic team/program. While student run programs do exist, the track record for them to exist over a long period of time is not good. However, there are some exceptions. A student run program has existed at Ohio State University for a long period of time. Anyone wishing to discover how that has been made possible, may wish to contact the Student Activities Office at Ohio State University to find out how the program has survived and to learn more about the program's administration. There are other student run programs as well but since no official record is kept of just how programs meet this description, it is difficult to determine just how many exist. A recent example of a student run program is at the University of Wisconsin, Madison. After many years of being without a forensic program, one has recently been revived as a student run program called the Collegiate Forensics League of the University of Wisconsin, Madison.

In attempting to get a team/program started, it is always helpful if a faculty member is involved as either the Director of the Program or as a faculty advisor. Having a faculty member as part of the drive to create a forensic program opens doors that may be closed to a student when attempting to gain access to files needed to recruit students for the team. Also, a faculty member may have more ability to book things on campus, such as vehicles and practice rooms etc. Admission offices on campus have the names of incoming students that may have expressed an interest in forensic activities. If this listing can be obtained, it gives the individual(s) attempting to start a team a place to begin. Once this list has been obtained, a letter could be drafted to send to the incoming students, welcoming them to the school, and inviting them to attend a meeting of the forensics team. This letter could also contain any additional materials related to the forensic program to help spike the students' interests in becoming a part of this new venture.

There are numerous methods of selecting team members. Some individuals may make the decision to develop a try-out system, others may work with anyone interested in participating on the team. This decision may be based on the rules of the college or university as well as the rules concerning the budget support for the program. Whatever system is favored by the person(s) attempting to begin a program, the final system may be determined by the Administration of the University or College, or the Department in which the activity is housed. In some cases, a student allocations committee may provide the financial support for the team, and thus may have a voice in determining the number of students as it is related to funding.

Besides the use of a letter to interested students, programs may have posters prepared and placed around campus during the first week of the school year, or

during any orientation sessions for the registering of new students. Another method of recruitment of students may be to ask your colleagues in the department to help identify students that may be interested or have the ability to do well. These students then could be approached individually or a letter could be sent to them, asking them to stop in and visit about the forensic program.

Whatever method is used to recruit students, it needs to be remembered that it will take work; it is not an easy task to just find students to begin a program. The first year may find only a small number of students willing to put in the time and effort to take part in forensic activities. However, it is a beginning. A program needs to build and develop and it may take several years until it is on a solid foundation, but it will be worth it. In the development of a program, one should be looking at the long run as well as the immediate situation of taking part in tournaments. As one approaches the establishment of a team, it needs to be recognized that it takes work. A dedicated individual is needed to spear-head the effort or it will not succeed. The following check list provides some of the things that this individual should consider:

- Starting a team is not a part-time job.

- Look for recruits,
  - Posters.
  - Recruit freshmen - Many freshmen get into patterns in which they will remain through school.

- Find free advertising.
  - School Newspapers.
  - Student Activities Handbook.

- Get meeting space.

- Recruiting.
  - Be positive.
  - Ease students into the activity.
  - Emphasize social aspects.
  - Be non-threatening.
  - Do not stop recruiting after the core has been established.
  - Consider what size team the budget can support.
  - Make sure students know you exist.

It is impossible to begin without being aware of the relationships needed to foster and develop a forensic program. This includes faculty members, administrative officers and offices, maintenance staff, business offices and others. If a program is going to be associated with an academic department such as a Department of Communication or with a Student Activities and/or Organizations office on campus, a number of areas will need to be determined.

In starting a forensics program/team, whether it is a student run program or a program supported by a department with a faculty member in charge, all of the following will need to be considered.

Budget Concerns: A team does not exist simply because there are students that wish to participate or there is a wish in the department to have a team. It costs money to have a program and the amount of money needed or available will determine what direction the program may take. Travel expenses will need to be determined and will include such things as transportation, lodging, meals and tournament entry fees. Equipment and reference materials for the program will need to be considered and will include supplies needed for the team. The cost of telephone, duplication, memberships and subscriptions will need to be addressed as well. The source of this money also needs to be determined. Not every department has the funding to support a program - be that for the team itself or for a faculty and/or a graduate student to direct the program. If it is a Student Activity funded program, what percentage of Student Fees may be allocated and how that allocation is determined will need to be investigated.

Financial Responsibilities: Whether it be a student-run program or a faculty directed program, someone must be in charge and responsible for all the financial matters related to the team. It is important to know exactly who that individual will be, what procedures must be followed, and what records must be kept. The documentation of expenses incurred, the signatures required in order to spend any money, the expense reports that need to be filed, the use of credit cards and the limitations imposed on any money and the person handling the money must be clear to everyone involved.

Travel Concerns: It can be assumed that the forensic program will be involved in activities off campus - i.e. attending tournaments, the issue of how one gets to the tournaments needed to be considered as well. The person in charge of the program will need to find out what the College/University policies are in regard to off-campus travel. Such things as the use of College/University vehicles, who may drive, how far may the vehicles be driven, who pays for the gas, what will be the charge for the use of the vehicles, or must rented vehicles be used, and insurance coverage are only a few of the things that need to be determined. In addition, the travel schedule for the quarter/semester or for the academic year will need to be determined. The amount of travel is directly related to the overall budget concerns and must be considered in determining the size of the budget needed for a program. Another way of looking at it could be to state that the size of the budget will determine how many tournaments a team may attend as well as the number of students that may be involved in the program.

Supervision/Direction of the Program: As stated earlier, whether it is a student run program or a faculty directed program, someone must be recognized as being in charge. This individual will need to be aware of school policies regarding not only the behavior of the students on the team, but also their own behavior on campus as well as off-campus. Serving as representatives of a university or college when traveling to and attending a tournament, all must recognize that the behavior of a team will have a direct relationship to the

College/University and the unit under which the team is operating. This would also include such things as what to do in case of an emergency in terms of travel and any medical issues.

Team Matters: Numerous factors entered into the question of starting a team. As stated earlier, the philosophy of the program will have a direct relationship to this issue. The recruitment of students will be a primary concern as one begins, and then later an on-going concern in order to maintain a program. The size of the program will be related to the number of students necessary to recruit as well as be related to the overall budget and how that budget money is determined. For instance, if the money comes from a student allocation fund, it may be necessary to show that the program involves as many students as possible. This is why it is important to know under what rules and procedures the program will be evaluated. In addition, the intra-relationship among the team members themselves will need to be considered. Will it be a team, or will it be a collection of individuals? The answer to this question and the leadership style of the person in charge of the program will determine just what type of forensic organization will evolve.

In starting a team, the immediate short-term goal of having a team and going to tournaments is usually the prime objective. In the first year of a new program, goals may need to be very general and may be directed to just keeping the team alive. However, if one really wants to establish a forensic team/program, one should be concerned with the survival of that program. The survival of a program requires that new recruits continue to join the team. They must want to come out. Attention should be given to the aspect of "team building" to insure that after the current year, there will still be a "team" and that it will continue after the initial organizer has graduated or the faculty member in charge has moved on to a new position. Here are a few ideas and suggestions for improving a team and team building:

GOAL SETTING:

- Set team goals for the year consistent with budget and resources available.
- Set a short-term goal targeting a particular event.
- Take into account:
  - Shared vision (common goals)
  - Teamwork
  - Individual-team accountability
  - Team identity
  - Positive team culture and cohesiveness
  - Open and honest communication

TEAM MEETING:

- Prioritizes needs
  - How do you plan on achieving them
- Evaluate progress toward goal achievement
- Deal with conflicts, work together to problem solve
- Forum to focus on goals and training

BUILDING TRADITIONS:

- Team Song(s)
- Team Shirts
- Team retreats at the beginning of the year
- Team dinners
- Team parties
- Team historians (documenting the year with quotations said throughout the year, pictures, etc.)
- Building a history of success (keeping old postings, tracking successful competitors)
- Spending time together socially
- End of year banquet
- Top Ten Lists - made up about the last tournament and shared at the meetings
- Warm-ups
- Recognizing achievement throughout the year in the meeting
- Attending out-rounds to support teammates
- Van ride conversations
- Workshops and workdays
- Special "far away" tournaments to reward hard workers

Once all of the work has been done to get a team together, thoughts may turn to how does one find tournaments to attend. There are numerous ways this can be accomplished. The first is to call other forensic programs in your area - check with the coach there to find out about tournaments. They will be willing to help you out. In addition, two of the national individual events organizations, the National Forensic Association (NFA) and the American Forensic Association (AFA), both publish a yearly calendar of forensic tournaments across the nation. The National Forensic Association calendar can be accessed on their web page, but in order to receive the American Forensic Association's calendar, the school must be a member of the AFA. Depending upon where you are located there may be forensic leagues which hold a series of one or two day tournaments. They are good places for a team to begin building their forensic experience.

If the team decides to have a goal of getting students to a national tournament, the decision will need to be made as to which national tournament. This may be based on what type of program is being built as well as to whether the school

is a 4 year or 2 year institution. There are numerous forensic organizations, such as Delta Sigma Rho- Tau Kappa Alpha (DSR-TKA) or Pi Kappa Delta (PKD) for 4 year institutions, and Phi Rho Pi for 2 year schools. There are a number of other organizations that could be appropriate for your institution and all can be reached via checking out their web pages or obtaining their address by checking with other coaches in your area. Do not be afraid to ask for help from others.

The legwork necessary to start a forensic program will not be easy as can be seen by the foregoing material. There are numerous hurdles that will need to be jumped, but if careful attention is paid to the details, if the dedication is there by the person attempting to start the program, as well as in the students that will be the first team members, it will prove to be a very rewarding achievement. The participants in the program will gain not only skills that will help them in their choice of careers but will also enable them to live a fuller and more rewarding life.

References

Clark, B.L., (1994). Team traditions: Building the future on the past. Paper presented at the SCA Convention, New Orleans, LA.

Dean, K.W. & Dean, K.C. (1985). Forensic recruiting within the university. *National Forensic Journal*, 3(1), 37-46.

Derryberry, B.R., (1991). The nature of the 'total' forensic program: The 1990s and beyond. *National Forensic Journal*, 9(1), 19-30.

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

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.

Rice, J.L. & Cummins, P. (2002). Building team unity: A traditional approach. *Speaker Points*, 9(2).

Finding Coaching Help

Brian R. Klosa, Minnesota State University, Mankato

Abstract

Coaching a forensics program on your own can cause burnout at a rapid rate. With students often competing in a half-dozen events each, the time it takes a coach to work on each event accumulates quickly. This article deals with ways to find competent outside help in ways that enhance student learning and coaching sanity.

Being a director of a forensics program can be a stressful juggling act. The demands of academic teaching, course preparation work, research projects, and Committee or department meetings are difficult to balance by themselves. Workman (1997) identifies six areas of competency that forensics directors must possess in order to succeed in their role of leading their forensics program. Workman notes that a director must be competent in the instruction of events, financial management, all areas of leadership, being an administrator, professionalism and as an interpersonal mentor for students.

The idea that coaches experience "burnout" from the excessive demands of collegiate forensics has received a fair share of critical attention. (Billings, 2002; Burnett, 2002; Holm & Miller, 2004). The majority of forensics teams do not have internal institutional assistance with department faculty or graduate students aiding in the running of their programs. The director is the sole individual responsible for all aspects of team management. This task can be extremely overwhelming, especially for the newly hired director of forensics.

However, help is available. This article will focus on how newly hired directors of forensics programs can find coaching assistance outside of their respective collegiate institution. This article will argue that coaching and judging help can be found by contacting and working with area high schools, thereby, reducing at least some of the overwhelming stresses a new director will feel.

Brand (1996) and Snider (1994) both argue that better bonds need to be established between high school and collegiate programs. Holm & Miller (2004) clearly articulate that college programs must have a "strong and healthy outreach" program with area high schools. Programs are built on the strength of high school recruits. These students have competitive experience and can comprehend the time, energy and discipline needed to compete in forensics. College directors, however, must be cautious of their approach in working with high school directors. In many states and regional areas, animosity often exists between high school and collegiate forensic programs. Billings (2002) clearly stipulates how high schools are often perceived by some college programs as merely "feeder programs." Inherent differences in competition events on both levels can also create this animosity. Both levels often don't understand these differences. Both levels assume their way of performing is superior. Unfortunately, when this assertion is challenged, strained relationships are often the result.

Dayton and Kay (2002) suggest that college coaches need to be aware of the structural differences between the arenas of competition. If college coaches realize these differences and are willing to work with them, then getting coaching and sharing in the resources of high school programs is a strong possibility.

High School Help

There are numerous ways to locate help on the high school level. Placing a call to a state's Board of Education office should provide the college director with a list of schools in the state that have speech and debate teams. Another option would be to contact the admissions office of one's collegiate institution for a list of all high schools in their respective geographical area. Then, through a process of phone calls, letters or E-mail, the director can discover which high schools have a forensics program.

The college director can also utilize the help of colleagues in locating high school coaching assistance. Department members may already have pre-established professional contacts and networks within the high school community. Conferring with faculty members in the institution's education training department will also provide informational access to high schools in the area.

After locating and contacting high school speech and debate directors, college directors can then tap into some very useful coaching resources. The primary way that high school programs can aid their college/university counterparts is through their networking capabilities. One high school director can introduce the college director to other high school coaches. Attending and judging a local high school tournament would allow for these introductions and networks to be established.

Finding enough qualified hired judges is always a difficult task for any tournament director on the high school or college level. If the college director is expected or desires to run a tournament, then tapping into the list of judges who work at high school competitions is extremely important for a successful and smooth tournament. Coaching help for the college director's program could be found in these individuals who frequently judge at high school tournaments. Additionally, the college director could use their college students to help provide judges for any high school tournament.

High school directors could also help the new college director with the logistics of running their college tournament. High school coaches are familiar with the area and can provide assistance in selecting local hotels, restaurants and/or entertainment options for the college tournament.

High school directors can also assist the college director with coaching help by providing names of students who are attending the college director's institution. Directors of forensics have often heard the painful sound of students admitting, "Oh, I didn't know we had a speech team on campus." Despite the most planned out recruitment strategies, plastering the campus with posters and advertising in classes, college forensics teams usually never encounter let alone even get to meet the vast majority of students who have high school speech experience.

High school directors are more than likely aware of which colleges or universities their former students are currently attending. Simply given a list of names can help the college director in their recruitment or coaching needs.

Finally, one of the biggest demands of any college coach is finding literature and topic ideas for the students on their team. While events will vary between college and high school speech, some literature and topic choices could be used on both levels. Many high school programs probably have some form of library or file of literature and topics. Just getting a start or exposure to ideas can aid the college director in organizing ideas for his or her team. Perhaps an agreement could be arranged where literature and topics are traded depending on the appropriateness of the student and their competitive level.

Conclusion

Being a director of a speech team can seem overwhelming. A new director has a large collection of coaching help at their disposal. If the new director is at an institution with a rich history in speech competition then contacting alumni for coaching help and assistance would seem a logical and prudent course of action.

However, getting in touch with area high schools can also provide the director with a wealth of coaching help. Differences clearly exist between the two levels. But these differences are only on the surface and with clear communication can be approached and worked out smoothly. Regardless of the level, high school and college competitors and coaches both share a common bond in that they participate in an activity that they love. Helping each other out with coaching or any other form of assistance can only strengthen that bond.

References

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

Brand, J. D. (1996). Collegiate forensic outreach to high schools: Supporting the forensic community. *National Forensic Journal, 14,* 37-44.

Burnett, A. (2002). Ain't no cure for the coaching blues. *The National Forensic Journal,* 20, 79-81.

Dayton, T. & Kay, R. (2002). Improving networking between high school and college forensic programs. *The National Forensic Journal, 20,* 74-78.

Holm, T. L. & Miller, J. T (2004). Working within forensic systems. *National Forensic Journal, 22,* 23-37.

Snider, A.C. (1994). Exploring the undiscovered country: Creating networks between high school and college forensic programs. *The Forensic,* 79, 28.

Workman, J. (1997). Solving for a healthy future: Creating national standards for training future directors of forensics. Paper presented at The Third National Developmental Conference on Individual Events. Houston, TX. August 13-16, 1997.

Building Relationships with Administration

Audrey Cunningham, University of Indianapolis

Abstract

Based on discussions with other coaches, administrators, as well as personal experience, this article focuses on how to build and maintain a healthy forensic program through relationship development with administrators of colleges or universities. Concepts of getting to know the administration, getting the team involved to provide service, publicizing awards, and offering administrators the opportunity for involvement, are explored as criteria for optimal program atmosphere.

Student housing on campus is a huge challenge for many schools with over crowded dorms. Housing programs that might not fall within the declarations of departmental functions proves even more challenging. For this reason, forensic programs have been housed in different areas on campuses throughout the years. Some have found homes in Student Affairs, Student Government Associations, and some are simply students who don't have an established program but fund themselves so they may experience the world of Forensics. Many programs do exist in a more traditional environment within the walls of a Communication Department. No matter where we keep our extemp files and interp folders, we must establish relationships with all levels of administrators to ensure our stability and growth. Sounds easy, of course; communication is the key. But, knowing just what the "right" communication is can be perplexing. Just like filling a prescription, the doctor (coach) must provide the patient (administrators) with the correct medicine with accurate dosage. It must be the perfect treatment. No matter to whom you report, administrators have different and varied opinions about forensics, which makes creating our prescription challenging. Sadly, our community has seen many programs eliminated when a new dean or department chairperson with a lack of knowledge about forensics wants to cut budgets. We have also seen new programs blossom when a supportive administrator steps forward. Thus, the goals of the institution and the goals of administrators have a definite impact on forensics.

If you are establishing a new program, you have the advantage to create your desired image with administration. But, no matter if you are establishing a new program or a new coach in an existing program, the first step is get to know your administration from the ground up.

Administration

Getting to know administrators may take some time depending upon the size of your school and the administrator's availability. However, some time invested in the beginning can open the door to insights on how to achieve what you want and develop positive relationships between the team and the administration. Stepping into an already existing program offers many challenges as well

as opportunities. Create your own image and don't rely on hearsay from outgoing coaches or current team members. You can strengthen the bond with an already supportive administrator or turn the head of a less supportive administrator to become an ally.

Begin by making appointments starting at the bottom. Meet with your department chairperson. This should be the easiest as he/she was probably on your hiring committee and most likely already has a positive impression. Even though you may have discussed your expertise, teaching styles, and goals, it helps to refresh and remind this administrator why you were chosen. In many colleges the upward structure might include the Department Chairperson, Division Chairperson, Dean, Academic Vice-President/Provost, and President. Smaller institutions may have fewer administrators, larger ones may have more. Be open about your intentions of getting to know the different levels of administrators to assure open communication lines. Above all, make sure you don't by-pass people in decision making positions. Take one level at a time to ensure everyone is in the loop.

A few recommendations for discussions include; always be upbeat and positive about the advantages of forensics and how forensics can benefit the university. Know what functions your team fulfills; academic, extra-curricular, and/or recruitment. Explain how your team will meet these through sharing short range and long range goals. Offer suggestions on how the team can help to create a positive image for the department as well as the university.

Campus and Community Involvement

Creating a positive image on campus has a positive impact on administration. Find out what activities are already available in which the team may participate. One of these activities simply could be having the team help with freshmen move-in day, which is also a great recruitment tool. Some colleges have extensive Welcome Week or Orientation activities which could benefit by the creative energies of your team. The second semester is a great time to prepare a performance for the university community which includes prepared events, public speaking and interpretive events. Performances can be scheduled through Lecture/Performance or Convocation Committees, Student Government Associations, Greek organizations, your department or simply through the efforts of the team. The students enjoy the opportunity to perform for their peers and administration recognizes the gift to the college community. From a coaching perspective, this offers a great practice opportunity prior to state or national tournaments. Some schools encourage off campus services through community programs or high schools. Many teams work with local high schools, coaching students, judging high school tournaments and even hosting a high school tournament. Offer to the administration performances at any of their functions. These may include other organizations such as performances at the Optimists Club Luncheon or judging the American Legion Oratorical Contest. These services can establish positive relationships with colleagues and administrators and offer opportunities for students to get recognized by leaders in the community.

Information Dissemination

Once you have established a relationship with administrators, keep them informed. If you have a university intranet or campus wide e-mail system, post individual and team successes. Make the most out of every set of tournament results by posting on the services available to you. Send out notifications to the students' hometown newspapers as well. Most institutions have some type of media relations department that will do this for you if you provide the information. However, since you are dealing with people with their own agendas, releasing this information may become less prioritized, especially with schools that push athletics as the recruitment and publicity medium. Be prepared to send out your own press releases. This process can be one of your strongest mechanisms for creating a positive image with your administration. Students who are recognized by their hometown newspapers get more enthused about the activity, willing to give more of themselves. Their parents, armed with bragging rights, become enthused about their child's participation, spreading the word of their positive experience under your leadership. Parents can become a powerful force. If you find this task overwhelming with an already overloaded schedule, get the team to help. A Public Relations or Journalism major is perfect for this assignment. Also, if you receive copies of the articles, forward them on. All of the articles might not get read in detail by upper administrators, but the reminder that the team is in the newspaper keeps your team in the positive image of the administration.

Forensic, Administrative and Community Outreach

If your team doesn't belong to one of the national organizations yet, make sure you get this done. They all have benefits; you just must decide which ones best suit your team's needs. Any participation and/or success at national tournaments make great public relations opportunities. In 1990, University of Indianapolis was on the brink of losing university funding. A first place finish in President's Division III at NFA provided the university with its first national title in any activity. Instead of losing the program, the budget was quadrupled the next year. The utilization of publicity and recruitment by the school was extensive and proved successful.

Hosting a tournament offers optimal positive use of administrators. Addressing an opening assembly, awards assembly, or handing out awards are easy yet positive tasks. The amount of time donated is minimal and creates a positive image for that administrator. Don't be surprised if some even like to judge. My department chairperson has judged our individual events and state tournaments for years. Several years ago, I had a dean who hosted the High School Shakespeare Contest on our campus and had been a debater in college. He enjoyed the opportunity to judge individual events, and in turn, I was a judge for his Shakespeare competition.

If the program is under scrutiny or the possibility of being cut, ask for help. Many directors have written letters to administrators at other schools in support

of that particular program and/or coach. This probably won't save a program but this can aid in the development of a program and the image of the coach. A simple note of thanks by another coach to your administrator for a deed a coach or team member has performed reinforces the belief that you and your team are well respected by your peers.

It would be easy if there was an easy 1,2,3 step program to establish positive relationships with administration. Unfortunately, we deal with individuals with various personalities and agendas. Thus, we can only evaluate our individual situations and make choices that we believe will help our programs thrive. Basic suggestions are: get to know your administrators, offer your team as a service for the university, publicize individual and team successes, and be open for involvement by administrators. Rely on your own instincts, be creative and thorough and you'll provide a strong foundation for your forensics home.

Forensic Coaches and The Law

Robert L. Frank, Berry College

Abstract

This essay discusses the primary legal challenges or concerns that face fledgling directors of forensics. The essay offers "unofficial" advice from a professor of communication law (not a lawyer) who was for a long time director of forensics. No attempt is made to break new ground in the understanding of any legal issue. Rather, the paper summarizes established law that affects coaching activities. The legal areas covered include: libel, copyright, liability, disability, privacy, harassment, and prior restraint, as they apply to forensics activities.

Since "the law" requires it, let me open with a disclaimer. I am not a lawyer **and** this article in no way should be interpreted as rendering legal advice.

The gist of this essay is quite simple: although these are unbelievably litigious times, as a fledgling director of forensics you really have little to worry about regarding legal landmines if you use common sense. Exercising "common sense" is the layman's equivalent of applying the "reasonable person" standard (Posner, 1997, p. 685) that permeates most legal decision-making.

Specifically, the legal issues I find most relevant to forensic coaches include (1) the distinction between public and private colleges; (2) liability regarding travel; (3) copyright; (4) defamation; (5) due process; (6) privacy; (7) disability/access; (8) harassment; and (9) prior restraint. These are arranged in order of importance as I see them.

(1) Public vs. Private. Consider it a given that it makes a world of difference whether you work at a private college or a public college. If you work at a public college or university, you are afforded all of the first amendment protections the law and the courts have amassed over the years. And these protections are vast in scope. If you work for a private college, you are best advised to think that you check your first amendment rights at the college gates. Coaches at private colleges only have the protections provided by their college by-laws, student codes of conduct and faculty/staff handbooks that outline "due process" procedures. (Poskanzer, 2002; The academic administrator, n.d: pp. 3-4; Chambers, 1972, pp. 242-246). Even private colleges are legally bound by their due process commitments as found in official documents.
To give an example: a student at Public University who elects to do an oral interpretation of a salacious portion of *The Color Purple* that many would find offensive would be immune from legal repercussions. Established obscenity law protects works of "literary" value from prosecution. The same is not true for a student at Private University. If the private college proscribes certain topics not in keeping with the

college mission it may do so at will. And the coach could be held responsible (Kaplan, 1985, pp. 142, 274-275).

(2) Travel Liability. Quite obviously, as director of forensics, you and your college are subject to the legal doctrine of "respondent superior" (Porter & Summerness, 2000). This means that the employee (you or your assistant coach) acts on behalf of the larger ("deep pockets") organization - the college. (Kaplan, 1985, pp. 71-72) If the director of forensics is guilty of causing an accident on a forensics trip while driving under the influence, the college itself is liable. To simply, if a driver of a Coca-Cola truck causes an accident through negligence, the Coca-Cola Company will likely be held responsible for damages. The same is true for directors of forensics (public or private). This principle holds true of any and all travel-related situations: if you tell your students to meet you in the morning at 7:00 a.m. near the elevator, and there are three separate elevators at the hotel, and one student gets kidnapped/assaulted at the "wrong" elevator, you (and your college) may very well be liable. (Lake, 2001) Moral: simply exercise prudence. Recognize that you will be expected to adhere to a normal "standard of care" in your state. Be very specific in your instructions to your students. One major liability issue for coaches involves student drinking. Certainly, students over the age of 21 have a "right" to drink alcoholic beverages. Just as certainly coaches may, and should establish a policy (preferably in writing) prohibiting drinking alcoholic beverages while at a tournament. Were any student found to have engaged in disorderly or criminal conduct while "under the influence," and the coach be shown to have knowledge of the student's drinking (and did nothing to stop it), a case could be made for tacit consent, and thus liability. Moreover, any damages done by drunken students (to hotel rooms, vehicles, etc.) could easily become the liability of the university. The *university* rents the hotel room or van, not the student. If the coach has a firm policy in place prohibiting drinking and can demonstrate that the policy is enforced, then institutional liability would be mitigated in cases where students acted in violation of such a policy.

(3) Copyright. In general, you have little to worry about here. "Fair Use" exemptions in copyright law protect you to the point that you can practically forget about any concerns in this area. (Middleton, Trager, & Chamberlin, 2000, pp. 234-244)

(A) Oral Interpretation. Whether your students are interpreting Prose, Poetry, Drama, P.O.I., or whatever - these interpretations (regardless of "amount" selected) are for educational purposes. Such purposes are generally protected under the "Fair Use" doctrine. The only issue ever raised in this area is the taping of oral interpretation finals at national tournaments. Most, if not all, national tournaments refrain from taping finals in oral

interpretation. There is the possibility that such tapes, offered for "sale," might be seen as commercial activities designed to obtain profits - a clear exception to the "Fair Use" doctrine. Participation in tournament activities (unless taped) clearly is educational in nature, and occasions no legal repercussions. In fact, the copyright law itself exempts classroom-like "face-to-face" recitation of copyrighted material. (Copyright Act of 1976; Harrington, 1989)

(B) Photocopies and Links. "Fair Use" doctrine allows for unlimited photocopies of copyrighted articles for Extemp files or for information/persuasive/rhet crit speeches. More technologically sophisticated forensics teams may rely on internal web sites or blogs that provide URL links to assorted articles on the internet. Thus far, the courts have found no problems (liability) for links in terms of copyright law. (Kubiszyn, 2000)

(4) Defamation. Although important, this is a no-brainer. Simply avoid expressing opinions about members of your team that might possibly defame them. This includes coaching sessions, post-tournament critiques. Even though "opinion" is generally exempt from legal retribution (McLean, 2003) if such "opinion" can be interpreted to have a factual basis, all bets are off.

(5) Due Process. Before you cancel a forensic student's scholarship or ban a student from participation on the team, be sure you have all bases covered. I generally tell the program directors under my purview (Forensics, Publications, Broadcasting) that I will not sign a letter canceling a scholarship unless I see two or three letters/emails to the student warning him/her of serious infractions that will jeopardize the scholarship. If you have precise warnings in writing, you have conformed to the "due process" requirements of the law. (Kaplan, 1985, pp. 212-214, 237-251)

(6) Privacy. This is an issue that seems benign. But you should be aware of FERPA requirements, nonetheless. (The academic administrator, n.d., p. 24)

Any director of forensics who cares about his/her program is interested in publicity - putting the best spin on the program's success. All well and good. But press releases should not go beyond the bounds of FERPA restrictions without the consent of students involved. If one of your champion students is blind, has M.S., is bi-polar, etc., you should never publicize these facts in a press release without the expressed consent of the individuals named. You might also be careful with distribution of photos of team members to the media, especially if these photographs might put the students in a bad light. Unless students have granted permission for release of their photographs, they have grounds for pursuing several privacy torts.

(7) Disability/Access. Whatever you do, strive to accommodate the disabled. You are required by law to do the best you can, within reason,

to accommodate the blind, physically handicapped, et. al. (Thomas, 2000). If your forensic practice room is upstairs, and there's no elevator, then arrange to have a practice session with a wheel-chair-bound student somewhere downstairs. This is one area where you do not want to be found "un-accommodating." If you host a tournament, be sure your campus is accommodating to the disabled (ramps, wide bathroom doors for wheelchairs, etc.).

(8) Harassment. If there is one area of law (court decision) that has proven inimical to free speech, this is it. Harassment (sexual, racial, religious, you-name-it) largely falls under the category of "employments laws," EEOC, etc. Unfortunately, court decisions in this area have not kept pace with constitutional protections in the realm of free speech. (Volokh, 2000). Until this gap is closed, my best advice is: (a) watch what and how you frame your criticisms of student performances. Make sure you use the same/similar language for males and females, blacks and whites, gays and straights, etc. (b) recognize that the courts are most averse to "egregious, pervasive" cases of harassment. Make sure your emails, web pages, critiques (oral or written) do not smack of harassment. "Harassment" in this case is most often defined as "hostile work environment." The courts interpret an "educational environment" in the same manner as "work environment." Until the pendulum swings in the direction of "free speech," you are advised to be careful in the phrasing of your critiques to those who have recourse to EEOC — which means anyone who is not a male WASP.

(9) Prior Restraint. Free speech doctrine in this area is pretty clear. In the public arena (not private) the government may not prevent, in advance of publication, speech unless (a) it is obscene as defined by law; (b) it amounts to "fighting words"; (c) it threatens national security; (d) it violates FCC or FTC administrative law; (e) it violates civil rights guaranteed by the constitution. (Pember, 2005, pp. 67-75)
It should be remembered: the established doctrine of prior restraint only applies to public institutions. As noted above, private colleges are permitted to apply far greater restrictions occasioned by their missions. And it should be regarded as axiomatic: the larger your school, the greater the concern for legal protection. "Legal protection" means avoiding lawsuits at all costs. University human resources agencies are interested in risk management. Everyone wants to protect the university from the *possibility* of a lawsuit. This is a fact of university life. But what I advise is don't ask HR/University lawyers whether you/your students can do X or Y. These people are paid to protect the university from the *possibility* of a lawsuit. They will invariably say "no," even though they would be likely to win in the event of a lawsuit. My advice is to follow your common sense, and deal with the lawyers later. You and your students have everything to gain. In sum, don't obsess over your legal obligations as DOF. Take comfort

in the doctrine of "respondent superior" - as an agent of the college, acting within the scope of your job as director of forensics, the college lawyers will almost always defend you. You will not be out on a limb even if you make an honest mistake. In fact, in nearly all lawsuits, the plaintiff will go after the "deep pockets" (the university), not you.

References

Chambers, MM. (1972). *The College and the courts; the developing law of the student and the college* (First ed.). Danville, IL: The Interstate.

Copyright Act of 1976, 17 U.S.C. §110. Retrieved July 16, 2004 from The Legal Information Institute Website: http://www4.law.cornell.edu/uscode/17/110.html .

Edwards, H.T., & Nordin, V.D. (1979). *Higher education and the law.* Cambridge, MA: Institute for Educational Management.

Harrington, J.G. (1989). Performance and copyright: avoiding the pitfalls. *National Forensic Journal, 8,* 127-132.

Kaplan, W.A. (1985). *The law of higher education; legal implications of administrative decision making* (Second ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Kubiszyn, M.S. (2000). *Emerging legal guidance on "deep linking."* Retrieved July 21, 2004 from Doug Isenberg's Gigalaw.com: Legal Information for Internet Professionals Website: http://www.gigalaw.com/articles/2000Kubiszvn-2000-05b.html .

Lake, P.F. (2001). The special relationship(s) between a college and a student: law and policy ramifications for the post in loco parentis college. *Idaho Law Review,* 37, 531+. Retrieved July 16, 2004 from Lexis-Nexis database.

McLean, D. (2003, December 1). Determining what constitutes opinion. *Communications and the Law.* Retrieved July 21, 2004 from High Beam database.

Middleton, K.R., Trager, R. & Chamberlin, B.F. (2000). *The law of public communication* (Fifth ed.). New York: Longman.

Pember, D.R. & Calvert, C. (2005). *Mass media law 2005-2006.* Boston: McGraw Hill.

Poskanzer, S.G. (2002). *Higher education law: the faculty* (First ed.). Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Porter, S.B. & Sommerness, M.D. (1991). Legal issues confronting the director of forensics. *National Forensic Journal, 9,* 109-123.

Posner, R.A. (1997). Book exchange: legal pragmatism defended. *University of Chicago Law Review,* 71, 683+. Retrieved July 16, 2004 from Lexis-Nexis database.

Thomas, S.B. (2000). College students and disability law. *Journal of Special Education,* 33, 2484. Retrieved July 21, 2004 from High Beam database.

Volokh, E. (2000). The constitution under Clinton: a critical assessment: freedom of speech, cyberspace, harassment law, and the Clinton administration. *Law and Contemporary Problems,* 63, 299+. Retrieved July 21, 2004 from Lexis-Nexis database.

Basic Training: An Assertion of Principles for Coaching Oral Interpretation for Intercollegiate Forensics Competition

Brendan B. Kelly, University of West Florida

Abstract

This essay explores a variety of basic issues and challenges a new coach will face when assisting students in navigating the experience of developing an oral interpretation performance for collegiate forensics competition. While the piece tends to focus on the event of prose interpretation, much of the content relates just as clearly to the events of duo, poetry, program oral interpretation and dramatic interpretation. The essay attempts to offer a set of starting points for the coaching process in terms of finding literature, choosing a specific piece, cutting scripts, and exploring performance-related issues.

Enabling students to meet the challenges of oral interpretation competition may seem a daunting task at the outset. Especially for the inexperienced coach, the challenges of mining literature resources, cutting scripts to meet time constraints, juggling the often unclear expectations of students, and coaching the performance can be overwhelming. This essay is directed to the individual who has just recently strapped on the boots of coach or director of forensics. Additionally, this essay is designed to serve the needs of the new coach who may be attempting to start a program by coaching novice competitors who are new to competitive oral-interpretive performance, or at least new to the intercollegiate forensic scene. This exploration of the initial adventures in a directorial role of forensics brings the art and science of *interp* back to the fundamentals of the process that still support and maintain the most longstanding and competitive collegiate programs in the United States.

Mining Literature Resources

Developing students as oral interpretation performers is a multi-step process that begins with *mining literature resources.* The search for student performance literature is a task best completed by a coordinated effort between coach and competitor. First, two eyes are always better than one, and second, the transactional nature of the search allows some discussion concerning the choice.

Rationale

While the primary goal of this process is to introduce and expose students to a wide array of poetry, prose and drama, at its heart, it is not simply a process of exploration. Rather, one primary rationale underlying the inclusion of oral interpretation in competitive forensics (from an educational perspective) is to breed and feed avid readers. Students are constantly in search of the "perfect

prose." Handing students literature that you have found on your private expeditions through the stacks is certainly not inappropriate. Indeed, it may be fueling the fire of curiosity. Additionally, providing students with literature and scripts that have been performed by students in the past is a common practice in collegiate forensics. This act gives students an introduction to that piece of literature (it is new to them) and an opportunity to mark it with the *personal* as they develop a fresh interpretation of the performance piece. An injustice that is possible in this process, however, is a failure to foster student interest in literature that they will carry beyond their time in college and competitive forensics. In the final tally, igniting, developing, and enhancing student skill in performance (as a communication art) and interest in literature is at the heart of the inclusion of oral interpretation in the activity.

Practical Choice Making

One of the central aims of the coach should always be to expand the mind of the student before them. That expansion requires that coaches introduce students to a wide array of channels through which to procure literature. The recent drift in collegiate forensics, at least in the mythological pining of conventional wisdom, places a high value on the most recent, unknown, and undiscovered literature as though these characteristics fuel the fire of "quality performance." While much of the literature that is performed on the collegiate circuit was published (in a perpetual cycle) within the last few years, that does not preclude the use of authors' work that has been celebrated for generations. Indeed, the work of Seamus Heaney, Joyce Carol Oates and Anton Chekhov never disappoint an audience if told with an appropriate voice, fresh persona, or simply, by an individual who has an ability to breathe new life into the familiar through the act *of oral interpretation.* Perpetually, students seem to move away from this brand of literature because it presents a different challenge than the latest David Sedaris montage (although Sedaris should also be celebrated for his unique voice).

This general discussion of choice making for performance literature is just that, general. It excludes a discussion of the nuances of the relationship between the forensics circuit as a public audience and a particular piece of literature. For instance, the 2004 National Forensic Association National Champion in Prose Interpretation performed "The Notebook" by Nicholas Sparks.[1] While this accomplishment should not preclude students from choosing to perform this piece of literature in the future, the coach and student should attempt to gain a clear understanding of the possible nuances of the relationship that the audience may have with this piece when they encounter it during the following season(s). If a student from another school (even if they were never exposed to the previous

---

[1]The publication date for this essay is 2005. The reference to the "The Notebook" refers to Jacob Hodgson from Eastern Michigan University. He won the NFA national championship last year (the most recent national champion in that event at the time of the composition of this piece).

year's performance of the piece) chooses to perform "The Notebook" during the 2004-05 season, they may come upon feedback from judges that mentions the fact that a student performing the same piece won the previous national tournament. The audience, in this case tournament judges, may deem the choice of literature as one that does not reflect that student's ability to mine fresh material that illustrates the students efforts to analyze the audience. While that student may bring new life to a performance of the story, the audience still may reject the choice given the nuances of the situation.

This discussion leads to the conclusion that all literature is fair game in the forensic community. The coach, however, maintains the role of guiding students toward literature choices that make creative, competitive, and communicative sense for that individual performer and the perceived/encountered audience. Fulfilling that responsibility, in this competitive environment, requires more than simply literary knowledge.

Mining Resources

The descriptive phrase of "mining resources" constructs an accurate image of the task of delving into the multitude of literary channels in search of fitting material. At the helm of the literature reservoir is the most obvious and affordable option: public collections. University and public libraries contain a rich variety of literary works in poetry, prose and drama. While it may seem silly to note that *"the library has books*", trends on the collegiate forensics circuit have steered students away from the publicly held stacks and into the armchairs at Barnes & Noble. Perhaps the Dewey Decimal System of Classification has proven to be more challenging than a bookstore shelf marked "PROSE." A bit of investigation, however, will prove that libraries contain many of the current (cutting edge) titles that are available in the box stores. Additionally, many libraries are dedicated to honoring book requests from patrons, which allows coaches to spend stretched budgetary allotments on travel, scholarships, and other related expenses.

If, however, the expense of a bookstore is not one that is prohibitive, then this option is, also, richly appealing. Confined in the walls of Borders, Barnes & Noble, Books-A-Million and other large book superstores are consistently stocked (and easy to locate) sections of poetry, prose and drama. While these collections maintain small quantities of classical texts, much of literature that is stocked is recently published material that certainly provides both coaches and competitors with a defined and refreshed collection of literature on a regular basis.

Additionally, beyond the grounds of the book superstore exist a wide variety of specialty bookstores (many of which service customers with online browsing and sales). This assortment of stores possess pointed in their collections that seek to meet the expectations of specific buyers. For example, Soliloquy (formally Act I) bookstore in Chicago, IL. is a store that provides literature the performance community. This shop maintains a rich stock of plays and stage performance pieces. While you may not live in Chicago, specialty shops such as this can be found in cities and towns around the US. Most are willing to sell via phone

or Internet, thus making their stock available to all. With collections that are often a mix of new and used books, specialty stores provide forensics coaches and competitors a pointed experience in the search for competitive literature.

Specialty stores, like book super stores and libraries, stock anthologies of prose, poetry and drama. Examples of such anthologies include: Prose-Scribner's Best Short Stories (published annually); Pushcart Press Collection (published annually); Duo-Humana Festival Collections (published annually); Best American Short Plays (published annually); Poetry-numerous collections of poetry are published frequently. A common thematic current often ties the collections together. If a student is searching for literature that deals with specific emotions, experiences, subject matter, or character attributes, taking a close look at the anthologies section of their local text haunt could prove very productive.

Finally, literary magazines, poetry journals, and online literary collections/forums provide exposure to cutting edge and current literature that is fresh and, often, unavailable in hardcover. The monthly or quarterly publications for literature often provide exposure to writers who are not yet (and may never be) marvels in the publishing world. Reading through these publications may provides a student a chance to work with material that is not mainstream for book publishing and that brand of literature presents a unique performance opportunity.

Crafting the Performance Piece: Script Choice, Cutting, & Editing

Choosing a Piece

The central issue in choosing a piece of literature for performance arrives in the issue of *person.* Pronouns and verbs used to indicate one speaking (I am—first person), one being spoken to (you are—second person), or spoken about (he is—third person) present the initial challenge in script choice. While each of these constructions for literature has been utilized in competition, the trend in collegiate forensics has tended toward first person in recent years. This trend does not indicate a lack of quality in 2nd and 3rd person work, but rather a sub-cultural norm in the forensics community. Conventional wisdom would suggest that the telling of a first person tale grants the performer an increased ability to connect with the audience, because they are able to enact and engage the characterization in a more direct fashion. While this argument seems to carry some credibility in a surface examination, succumbing to popular thought does not always keep us on the path to truth. The collection of individuals who have, in recent years, performed second and third person material constitutes a clear minority in the full breadth of the interpretation slots entered into collegiate competition nationally. In this way, it is certainly fair to refer to 1st person literature as the current norm in choice of performance piece. Yet, that does not preclude 2nd and 3rd person choices. A great performance relies on the performer to be great. Perhaps the most fitting closure to this discussion arrives in the old adage, "some people are so talented that they could make the phone book sound interesting." Allowing cultural norms to prevent a student from exploring a piece of literature (or the phone book) in perform-

ance, goes against the core values of the activity. In the same moment, failing to recognize that cultural norms exist and will partially, if unfairly, fuel the evaluation of performances in forensics is foolish.

Cutting: Crafting the Content

The notion of crafting the script can seem like an awesome roadblock for the new coach guiding novice competitors. While an experienced student may be able to generate a vision of the direction in which they believe a script/performance should go, however flawed and misguided that perspective may be, indeed the novice competitor (especially one that has limited exposure to any stage or level of forensics competition) may find a greater challenge in trimming a short story, novel, collection of poetry or play to a ten minute performance piece. There is a small collection of guiding principles that will assist in getting both coaches and competitors started in the process.

First, conceptualizing a content line for the performance is the initial step in the purposeful transformation of a piece of literature to a performance piece. As it relates to the event of prose, this refers to the isolation of the story within the story. A coach and/or student may find that devising a script for a 10-minute performance is impossible with some pieces of literature. There are many wonderful short stories and novels in the world; however, cutting a piece for performance places some limitations on certain storylines. At the end of the day, some stories cannot be effectively told in ten minutes. This is an important premise upon which to initiate the process. While the point has been a subject of debate in the past, the performance piece does not contain the complete story content, poetic attributes of language, or dramatic environment that comprised the original published work. The cutting process generates a new entity. This product reflects and respects the integrity of the author's original work (at least in theory), but also uses the content to impact an audience in a different fashion. Even the adaptation of dramatic literature requires the conversion of the performance context. In the end, the adaptations become entities in themselves designed for a competitive performance environment.

A successful conceptualization stage requires that the coach and competitor negotiate a sense of how they believe the material should impact the audience. When cutting a prose, for instance, the story may contain a central storyline as well as a variety of minor content lines, characters, and relationships that all contribute to the construction of the central line. Quickly coming to terms with the fact that all of these elements will not make their way into the performance piece (given time constraints) often makes it easier to begin removing elements (relationships, characters, etc.) that do not contribute to the chosen content line.

A second key concept in the process of cutting material for competition is the matter of "he said" "she said" and other tag lines. There is a performance choice to be made when a competitor or coach confronts this element, specifically in prose or drama. Removing this brand of tag line provides the performer an opportunity to enact the character shifts (living persona alterations), rather than

orally providing to the audience, through varied and distinct characterizations. Additionally, a performer's use of those lines to enhance a primary character reading of another's words also presents a unique performance option. While the collegiate trend leans toward the removal of such references, that trend certainly does not prohibit another performer from including them in the piece. Students who explore performance options fill forensics interpretation events with intrigue and the unexpected.

Cutting a script for prose, developing a program of poetry, or cutting a complete play for the stage to a ten minute duo each present the coach and student with a different set of challenges. There is no prescription for how the process must be enacted. Regularly, sets of coaches and students from different teams choose to perform the same literature. Somehow, each set develops an utterly different content structure, interpretation, characterizations, physical choices, etc. and each team utilized a different developmental process. The product of each team's practice is unique, yet the principles at the root of that process are similar. This essay scratches the surface of those roots and provides a limited viewing window into the developmental possibilities.

In the end, there is no magic set of directions the cutting a high quality script for competition. It is a practice that requires time, testing and numerous drafts that explore different options on paper and in performance. Each set of coaches and students will develop a unique epistemology related to the process that will become a page in the team's ontological development.

Developing and Refining Performance Choices: The Interpretation in Action

This practice is a challenging issue to discuss given the limitations of an essay, much less one focused on an activity overview, because the possibilities that exist in performance are only limited by the imagination and experience of the multitude of performers in collegiate forensics. In order to provide new coaches with substantive material related to oral interpretation performance technique, strategy, choice making, etc., this essay includes references (see footnote 2) to several celebrated authors who provide some of the richest written work on the subject[2]. These sources are appropriate and high quality starting points for work in the oral interpretation of literature.

While there is a vast selection of sources on the subject, these current texts by key authors in the discipline provide discussion on a full range of issues related the art of oral interpretation performance.

---

[2]The following are excellent resources concerning oral interpretation-process & performance:

-Roles in Interpretation, 5th Edition by Judy E. Yordon

-Oral Interpretation by Charlotte Lee, Timothy Gura

Discussion

Two values should structurally support the process for the coach. First, the student's education should be put at the forefront. The quality of speech and debate as an activity is based wholly on the education coaches and directors provide the students of each generation. Students need to be taught how to develop their own method for cutting scripts. Students need to be taught the various ways to find literature, develop characters, and assist others in developing their performances. Students need to be taught that the interpretation is not simply something that can be taught from a book. Rather that it is an act that requires one to tap into reservoirs of energy and intrigue inside oneself, then allow it to bubble up from that secret interior place so that the experience becomes shared; audience and speaker.

If each generation of students in forensics is taught well, then some of those students will become the next generation of teachers (coaches). This cycle will perpetually support a rich educational and competitive experience for students around the country. Hopefully each generation of coaches will continue to strive to extend the boundaries of our collective performance experience by encouraging their students to explore, take risks and have fun with the opportunities that this activity provides.

Understanding Public Address Events

George LaMaster, Marian College

Webmaster's note: URL in bibliography changed to reflect permanent location.

Abstract

The process of invention is central to coaching the public address events. Teaching invention means that students do not imagine that they are learning a prescribed formula for effective public speaking. Instead, students self-consciously engage in reading the forensic community's norms, and they craft a strategic response to an evolving rhetorical situation. Effective coaches foster an engaged rhetorical sensitivity. Practical suggestions include encouraging students to expand their critical vocabulary, negotiate an event's conventions, make difficult choices, and continually revise personal goals for competition. Coaching that emphasizing the process of invention over the final product secures the value of a rhetorical education.

The rules for the four public address events are simple. Each speech must be delivered from memory and last less than 10 minutes. The National Forensic Association describes the categories as follows:

> PERSUASION: A speech to convince, to move to action, or to inspire on a significant issue.
>
> INFORMATIVE: The contestant will deliver an original factual speech on a realistic subject to fulfill a general information need of the audience. Visual aids that supplement / reinforce the message are permitted.
>
> AFTER DINNER: Each contestant will present an original speech whose purpose is to make a serious point through the use of humor. The speech should reflect the development of a humorous comedic effort, not a stand up comedy routine.
>
> 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 aims of Persuasive Speaking and Informative Speaking are self-evident. The After Dinner speech may be informative or persuasive in purpose, but it must also try to make the audience laugh. The injunction against performing a stand up routine merely underscores that this event requires a coherent speech that develops a particular topic. Finally, the event Rhetorical Criticism is modeled after academic rhetorical criticism. Students adopt a critical methodology - such as examining the role of metaphors - in order to analyze a rhetorical artifact - such as a President's speech. That's it. No other rules, save ethical guidelines, limit the speaker's invention.

Of course, the much ballyhooed unwritten rules of forensic competition impose an ambiguous tangle of additional expectations. In the halls of a speech and debate tournament, you are likely to overhear a lot of spurious advice traded in absolute maxims. Speeches labeled a "Persuasion" must have three main points: problems, causes, and solutions. Successful topics in Informative Speaking always concern new developments in science and technology. An After-Dinner speech just can't win without big, physical humor - and your entry in Rhetorical Criticism should never analyze a text as dry and dull as a President's speech. Seasoned coaches remember well the exceptions to all of these rules, teach that the unwritten expectations for an event change, and encourage students to resist reducing their creative choices to a prescribed formula for success. The conventional wisdom of the day or the region is no more than that: a set of discursive constraints that each speaker must discern and navigate, meeting the audience's expectations in some ways and exceeding those expectations in other ways. One key to understanding the public address events is to focus on the process of invention. Students read the (sub)cultural norms that shape expectations for their speech; and then, they make choices about how their rhetorical act may most effectively enter the forensic scene. By focusing on invention, coaches can transcend teaching the formulaic tricks that (they hope) score points and help students develop an engaged rhetorical sensitivity. Whether or not you are already familiar with the conventions that constitute these events on the college circuit, coaching the process of invention promotes rhetorical education.

The first of the five classical cannons of rhetoric, invention need not be artificially distinguished from arrangement, style, memory, and delivery; nor should it be reduced to the discovery of possible arguments. Broadly conceived, invention names a process of judgment: discerning the available means of persuasion and making a choice about how to intervene with symbolic action. Students competing in one of the public address events may revise a single speech more than twenty times over the course of a year. From topic selection to polishing delivery, they engage in strategic crafting and re-crafting of their message as their understanding of the rhetorical situation evolves. A student who is adept at the art of invention displays rhetorical sensitivity. The rhetorically sensitive person can read a rhetorical situation and find a fitting response. Rhetorical sensitivity is a primary good of forensic education; a preparation for democratic citizenship. What does focusing on invention mean for coaching the public address events? I offer the following practical suggestions.

(1) *Expand your team's critical vocabulary.* Much of coaching, I think, already falls under the heading of expanding vocabulary. We leach distinctions via the language of public speaking: a sign-post word vs. a transition, the harms vs. the significance of the problem, writing in the active vs. the passive voice, adding a justification for the choice of a rhetorical artifact vs. a justification for the choice of a critical methodology. The vocabulary we teach helps students to articulate why some speeches are more persuasive than others. As Charlie Parrott notes in this issue, the forensic community adds its own constellation of slang terms as well. Intentionally building a critical vocabulary provides more tools for

students as they interpret what works and what doesn't and why in their particular event. As any coach will attest, much of the learning in forensics takes place on the ride home. You can measure the maturity of a group by listening to how they talk about their speeches and other competitor's speeches. It is the coach's responsibility to raise the level of discourse - from claiming "that judge was an idiot" to recognizing that "lay judges bring different expectations than judges inculcated by their own participation in forensics..." One of the best recourses for building vocabulary is simply to talk with experienced coaches and competitors about what performances they have seen in competition, what they have liked, and why. If you're new to coaching the activity, ask what people mean by their jargon. They'll be more than happy to expound.

(2) *Negotiate the events' conventions.* As noted above, the expectations for speeches in these four events are defined more by their unwritten rules than the written ones. In some ways, a good speech is a good speech - whether it is delivered in forensic competition, at the local P.T. A. meeting, or from the steps of the Lincoln memorial. In most ways, however, the unique rhetorical situation makes all the difference. Encourage students to explore the norms that define the events: What are the unwritten rules? What are the exceptions to those rules? What is rewarded and what is disciplined concerning topic selection, organization, and types of argument? What style of language and manner of delivery is privileged? Of course, the answer to those questions varies from year to year and region to region and judge to judge. One excellent resource is to order video tapes of the final round performances at the previous year's national tournament. (See the NFA website for details.) Have students compare those performances not only with their own speeches, but also with their experience in a public speaking class, high school speech and debate, or any other speaking venue. The differences will highlight the unique norms that constrain the four public address events in inter collegiate competition. As students develop their notion of "the formula" that succeeds in competition, encourage questioning how some speakers succeed by taking a risk and breaking the mold. After all, merely meeting the median of expectations rarely wows an audience.

(3) *Present students with choices.* As students develop their critical vocabulary and negotiate their event's unwritten rules, they should discover that competition in forensics, like life, is a series of choices. Coaches can focus on invention by helping students to identify and evaluate strategic choices - and by resisting the urge to make those choices for the students. If I take home a stack of speeches on Friday, "fix" them, and return those scripts to students on Monday, then I have short-circuited the student's inventional process. I have made the choice and the student is at a loss as to the rationale. One simple practice that preserves the student's own invention is to prioritize coaching students' performances rather than scrutinizing their written scripts. Insist that students perform the speech (or at least read the script) out loud. After all, that is the way the speech will be received in competition. Then, coach and student can work through each choice together. Moreover, when each coaching session is an opportunity to make choices, the student can take ownership of the process.

Topic selection and definition provides a case and point. The ideal topic is a topic for which the student has a passionate interest and a topic that is likely to please judges in the event. When a student feels that he or she must make compromises between the two, coaches can help that student imagine the implications...and let the student makes the choice. Another way to encourage making choices is to insist that students receive feedback from multiple coaches. Encourage peer coaching with other members of the team. Take every ballot from a judge seriously. Enlist the aide of colleagues teaching public speaking. Inevitably, the student will receive conflicting advice. Coaches focused on teaching invention will empower students to sift through competing suggestions. The student must choose whether or not to cut a paragraph, add a visual aid, or tell the risque joke. For coaches with a lot of confidence in their knowledge of what works and wins in the activity, this may mean allowing a student to make the "wrong" choice. Knowledge of the activity positions coaches with considerable power over students; that power ought not to be abused. Granting students full ownership of the inventional process secures learning.

(4) *Set goals - and revise them.* The examples above point out that the student's speech is both an act of self-expression an act of strategic persuasion. Coaches coach should not presume to know which aim is most important for the student. We should ask questions. What are your goals for this season? This speech? This upcoming tournament? This coaching session? If invention is discovering a fitting response to a given rhetorical situation, then the student must first name his or her goals in this situation. It is far from sufficient (or accurate) to assume that each student's goal is simply to win. Each coaching session can include some time for talking about where a student is in the process of preparing for competition and what the student's next step should be in that preparation. As other commitments intrude on their time, students often need to revisit and revise their ambitions. Coaches that listen to the whole person in these conversations can help students set realistic objectives and develop realistic assessments of their success and failure. As students meet their own goals and exceed their own expectations, they win confidence in their own ability to face constraints and invent a fitting response.

Whether it is the trophy at the end of the weekend or the national tournament at the end of the year, students are understandably focused on the final product. After all, it is their performance that will be evaluated. Coaches know that it is the coach's job to be focused on the process - the process of invention. Teaching invention means that students do not imagine that they are learning a prescribed formula of absolute maxims for effective public speaking. Instead, they self-consciously engage in reading a particular community's norms, and they craft a strategic response to an evolving rhetorical situation. The latter is a far richer education in rhetoric.

References

NFA Individual Events Rules: Description of Events. (2000). National Forensic Association. Available: http://www.nationalforensics.org/ierules.html.

Understanding Limited Preparation Events

Ian Turnipseed, University of Alabama

Abstract

Limited preparation events are often seen as limited practice events for many students and even coaches. Because of the feeling that one cannot control for what topic they will draw, futility sets in when attempting to improve at limited preparation events. This essay offers constructive ways to learn and implement the inner-workings of a strong limited preparation speech.

Limited preparation events much like the horse of a different color in *The Wizard of Oz*—every time a student competes in them, a completely new experience occurs. Each competitor must either be prepared to speak on myriad world events each weekend, or interpret a wide range of different quotations. In doing so, understanding and competing in limited preparation events becomes intrinsically difficult. Additionally, critics (i.e. judges) must employ a different paradigm in assessing limited preparation events. As a judge of extemporaneous speaking, one must (a) flow arguments, (b) judge fluency, (c) examine ethos, (d) consider the grasp of the English language, and (e) take into account competitors inherent knowledge on a topic, i.e. argument strength. Impromptu judges must evaluate (a) the different interpretations of the quotation, (b) the strength of arguments and examples, (c) the coherency of the speech presented, (d) speaking poise, (e) argument clarity and overall presentation, all the while taking into account the amount of preparation time used in speech creation. Without question, limited preparation events are a horse of a different color within the forensic world.

Still, instructing competitors in limited preparation events requires one to follow a simple set of criteria to create proficiency in these events. Holland (1994) is right when he posits that "the heart of any argument is the evidence that supports it." Thus, the creation of the argument is central to the construction of both extemporaneous and impromptu speeches.

Extemporaneous Speaking

First, understanding the inner workings of extemporaneous speaking, as a coach, is a yeoman's task. Crawford (1984) explains that "even those students fortunate enough to have a dedicated coach are likely to be frustrated during competitions because of the inconsistencies that occur between and among coaches, tournaments, and judges with respect to the philosophy of the extemporaneous speech." These differences in philosophy form in two main areas: question difficulty and source usage.

Question Difficulty

Question difficulty and, consequently, question selection is intrinsic to success. Thus, the presentation of arguments and structure of a speech is a more important issue than the information presented. Most coaches advocate a two-point unified analysis approach to extemporaneous speaking, which is the use of two separate sub-theses to independently prove the thesis. The application of this method is very different to closed-ended questions and open-ended questions. Some critics believe that a closed-ended question requiring a yes or no answer is more difficult because of the level of analysis it takes to answer the question. Take, for example, the closed-ended question "Can Thabo Mbeki overshadow Nelson Mandela in re-shaping South Africa?" Either answer to this question (yes or no) is plausible, but for a truly good examination of this issue the analysis must be deep and centralized. This type of question requires the competitor to speak not only of Thabo Mbekis' accomplishments in office but to weigh those accomplishments against the legacy of Nelson Mandela, whose personal efficacy in South Africa is renowned worldwide. Simply put, as a critic, a question like this requires the competitor to convince you of a single idea, but must provide deep and insightful arguments to do so. As a competitor, to answer a question of this verbal simplicity but of ideological magnitude requires a modicum of knowledge regarding South African history and political landscape, making Holland (1994) is correct when he asserts that "without general knowledge of current events, a student will spend his or her preparation time learning about a topic."

Open-ended questions require a knowledge of current events before entering prep as well, but, in contrast, these types of questions require more structural integrity than closed-ended questions because they offer the extemporaneous speaker the ability to craft their own answer. Whereas closed-ended questions require competitors to construct two sub arguments that support one main yes or no answer, an open-ended question requires a competitor to create a thesis that is broad enough to encompass the two main points. Each point must prove not only the thesis, but also must have better structural integrity than a normal point due to the nature of an open-ended answer. Take, for example, the open-ended question of "What alternatives can America provide to the EU with regard to sky marshals on international flights?" The answer to this question could be any number of things including but not limited to, (a) grounding suspected flights, (b) creating a stolen passport database, or (c) creating biometric passports. A competitor must choose two and fit them under one unified thesis, such as: "America must cooperate with the EU in protecting passports." The thesis does not directly answer the question without the two main arguments' support. In sum, open-ended questions provide much more difficulty in arranging and presenting arguments, but provide advantages in terms of complex argument structures and flexibility in precise responses.

Source selection and citation

As a competitor or critic, time is always a crucial factor in any limited preparation event. Regardless, there must be a reasonable amount of credible sources to give credence to any argument. The use and number of sources hinges on structuring arguments. Holland (1994) rightly tells us that the extemp file is a necessary evil, because sources are used to establish scope, significance, and timeliness—not to mention providing evidence in each sub point of a speech. Using the previous example of South African politics, a competitor might answer "no" and make one of their two major theses that Mbeki will not overshadow Mandela because of Mandelas' social changes. Citations must now be used to support this thesis.

In dealing with sources is the number of sources sited, Holland (1994) posits, "is a speech that cites nine sources better than a speech that cites five?" This is a question whose answer is heatedly contested, because the number of sources presented in a speech is often directly linked to the validity of the arguments presented. Most successful extempers will use anywhere from nine to twelve sources to support their speech. Although, this is a high number for beginners, it is ideal. The important idea to stress is that a speech isn't good because it has nine to twelve sources; it's good because these sources create a well-formulated argument. Nine sources allows a competitor one source in his introduction to show relevance to a topic, and two sources per sub-thesis to prove that their theses are not only true but the arguments are valid.

Finally, a competitor should outline two truths. For instance: one, Mbeki is not a racial harmonizer, and two, South Africa is still enamored with Mandela. Both statements could be argued to be true but require evidence to prove them. For the first sub-thesis (Mbeki is not a racial harmonizer), a competitor could use evidence from the *International Herald Tribune*, April 27, 2004, lamenting that Mbeki reminds the people of South Africa of their racial divide where as Mandela transcended it. This source proves that Mbeki is not a racial harmonizer where as Mandela was, proving the first sub-thesis. This sub-thesis does prove that Mandelas' social changes outweigh Mbekis' and, therefore, provides one reason that Thabo Mbeki cannot overshadow Nelson Mandela in reshaping South Africa. While it is easier to read this information in paragraph form, most competitors would learn it best from an outline form that usually looks like this:

Q: Can Thabo Mbeki overshadow Nelson Mandela in re-shaping South Africa?
A: No

Point 1: Mbeki is not a racial harmonizer.

IHT (International Herald Tribune) April 27 '04-Mebki reminds people of S.A. of racial div., Mandela transcends.

Point 2: South Africa is still enamored with Mandela.

The point of the above outline is that the competitor should use as few

words and as many abbreviations as they can in order to conserve time, but clearly understand how their speech will flow and in what order.

Nonetheless, sources do not make the argument; they enforce it. While the information from the *International Herald Tribune* does show how Mandela was a better racial harmonizer than Mbeki, it is the explanation of this information that is crucial. A competitor must be able to synthesize this information and explain the implication it presents. In the case of the aforementioned explanation of a sub-thesis it would be important for a competitor to explain that in South Africa racial segregation was how the country was politically controlled and that Nelson Mandela made race relations such an important issue because in order for his country to survive the White and Black populations must work hand in hand to create a future. Then, a speaker must synthesize the point by creating a link back to the first sub-thesis: "Mbeki is not succeeding in doing this and thus creating divisions that Mandela strove to close." Basically, critics need highly structured information so that sources will make sense and give them an easy way to follow complex argumentation. Competitors need structure to place their information due to the fact that it gives them a way to understand and retain the information they are going to present.

Impromptu Speaking

While impromptu speaking is frequently paired with extemporaneous speaking, the event offers uniquely different challenges. Impromptu does require the same answer, major thesis, and sub-thesis structure as extemporaneous speaking, the information provided comes from within the individuals own interests and compiled knowledge. Reynolds and Fay (1987) believe we emphasize how impromptu tends to draw and reward the well-read individual. Three considerations in mastering Impromptu must be explored (a) time usage, (b) quotation interpretation, and (c) diversity of information.

Time Usage

Time usage is very important because as Billings and Billings (2000) explain "you're probably thinking there's so much to do in such a short amount of time" (p. 38). However, the structure honestly forces a timed pattern on each speech, which is actually a benefit." Essentially, a competitor has seven minutes to create and deliver a speech. A competitor should use no more than two minutes to prepare the speech. Consequently, a "good" impromptu speaker should use only a minute and thirty seconds in order to allow for a buffer in explanation of any given point. Using Billings and Billings (2000) an impromptu speech should look something like this:

0:00	Begin attention-getting device
0:30	Introduce thesis
0:45	Give preview of main points

1:00	Begin Pt. 1A
1:45	Begin Pt. IB
2:30	Synthesize point 1
2:45	Begin Pt. 2A
3:30	Begin Pt. 2B
4:15	Synthesize Point 2
4:30	Review and conclude

While, this is an exact outline of time allotment; there is some give and take in the use of time in these areas to create an effective speech. The above outline is written for a high school impromptu speaker. In collegiate forensics, a competitor should attempt to speak for at least five minutes and thirty seconds, which would give them more time to elaborate on the above outline. The most important issue to consider as a competitor is to use time signals effectively. Every impromptu judge should give verbal time signals while the competitor prepares their speech and hand gestures from 5 minutes left down to thirty seconds, fifteen, five, and zero. As a competitor utilizing these time signals will increase the chances of including everything that they would like to cover and presenting a structured two sub-thesis speech. For instance, if a competitor sees the three minute signal they should know that they need to be in point 2A; if not they must employ word economy to move the speech along. In sum, time issues are critical in impromptu and, in order to fight the clock, a competitor must constantly practice preparing an impromptu speech in a minute thirty seconds to two minutes in order to allow enough time at a tournament to present a well reasoned speech.

Quotation Interpretation

Perhaps the largest use of preparation time in impromptu speaking is crafting a fitting interpretation to the quotation. While it is almost absurd for critics to expect competitors to formulate an interpretation that fits their idea of what the quotation means, it is a reality. Thus, in preparing for impromptu speaking, competitors must spend a large amount of time (a) reading quotations, (b) interpreting them, and (c) discussing that interpretation with their coach or a team mate in order to understand what is a "good' interpretation as opposed to a "bad" interpretation and why. Take, for instance, the quotation "The religions we call false were once true" by Ralph Waldo Emerson. This could be interpreted to mean that "societal definitions evolve with societal change" or, "religion evolves through time." Both interpretations could be correct, but one will by and large be considered by critics to have more depth and societal implications. The reason is preciseness of language in presenting, an argument. The first thesis broadens "religions" into an issue of society, giving the speaker more latitude in examples and proof while simultaneously remaining within the broad realm of social constructs like religion. The second thesis is more simplistic, but also correct; unfortunately, it forces the speaker to focus on religion in discussing the quotation, which limits examples and sub theses. In creating two sub theses, competitors

must be cognizant of these factors as well. Each sub-thesis must present a complex idea that can be explained in a simple manner. Essentially, an impromptu speaker must take a quotation and broaden the meaning of the quotation in order to give themselves more latitude of examples and sub theses but also to beautify their language. The only way this can be accomplished repetitively is through consistent practice before tournaments.

Diversity of Information

While the thesis of an impromptu speech is important, the sub theses hinge on the diversity and type of information presented. Sellnow (1989) explains that "many of the same current events, historical figures, and philosophical thought are used as generic evidence" (p. 3). Generic evidence should be avoided because while an example of Nazi Germany, Hitler, *The Simpsons*, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, etc. might fit perfectly in their explanation of a sub-thesis it will hinder the competitor because (a) these are arguments many have heard before and (b) it makes the speaker's knowledge appear limited. Today, impromptu speakers must draw from myriad of sources in order to enforce the idea that they are a "well-read individual." Therefore, in the use of information, an impromptu speaker should diversify their sources, much like the format of *USA Today*. The format consists of four sections: current events, money (economy), sports, and life (entertainment). In much the same way, impromptu speeches should cover four different areas with their information. For instance an impromptu speaker could use an anecdote about President Bush, a story about Dr. Dre, an explanation of the Internet, and an example of banking to fully discuss the aforementioned Emerson quotation. That outline would resemble;

Q- The religions we call false were once true.
Interp-Societal definitions evolve with societal change

1- Societal shifts in perception redefine the individual
A- G. W. Bush
B- Dr. Dre

2- Technological advancements redefine societal belief in the "possible"
A- The Internet
B- The U.S. Central Bank

However, the outline depicted above presents one of the key factors in teaching impromptu—specificity. The above examples of information are very broad; when presenting information in a preview the tags given to the info should be precise. A student should outline the tags of their points in the language in which they want to present them:

Q- The religions we call false were once true.
Interp-Societal definitions evolve with societal change

1- Societal shifts in perception redefine the individual
A- G. W. Bush's first public office-Governor of Texas B-
Dr. Dre's fight to stay gangster after *Aftermath*

2- Technological advancements redefine societal belief in the "possible"
A- Internet reliance on the porn industry
B- The U.S. Central Bank's push for a cashless society

In looking at the example above, the tags make sure that the speaker knows exactly what is going to be said and makes them remember the way in which they should present it to a judge so that they may easily follow the speech. Simply put, specificity of sources demonstrates a better knowledge of the information they are about to present, and shows the critic that they can articulate it in a rapid and succinct manner.

Another issue in information use is weighting the information a speaker presents. Billings and Billings (2000) explain "it is at this point that the question usually arises regarding the use of personal or hypothetical examples" (p. 38). While personal and hypothetical examples are more geared toward high school impromptu speaking, a college level speaker could ask a question to themselves regarding the use of pop culture or real world examples in their speech. While one would posit that pop culture examples have the same if not more relevance to the audience and judge, real world examples are often times thought of as more concrete and important. Simply put, critics find examples that are more "real world" to be more impacting. So, an impromptu speaker should create a balance between pop culture (Snoop Dog) and real world examples (Gerhard Schroder).

With this understanding of basic limited preparation issues, competitors and coaches alike should be able to convey the meanings within their limited preparation speeches with better clarity. Faules, Rieke, and Rhodes (1976) argued that extemporaneous speaking may well be the most valuable education event offered in forensics. Indeed, limited preparation events provide great pedagogical opportunity. The forensic community should not strive for following successful forensics "formulas," but rather implement guidelines such as the ones in this essay to maximize the educational value in forensics.

References

Billings, A. C, & Billings, A.C. (2000). Understanding impromptu: Pedagogical and practical applications of coaching a limited preparation event. *The Rostrum, 76(1),* 31, 38, 67.

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

Faules, D. R, Rieke, R. R., & Rhodes, J. (1976). *Directing forensics: Contest and debate speaking* (2nd ed.). Denver: Morton Publishing Co.

Holland, B. (1994, April). *Coaching extemporaneous speaking: Creating an entertaining argument.* The Eastern Communication Association Convention, Washington DC.

Reynolds, C. L., & Fay, M. (1987). Competitive impromptu speaking. *National Forensic Journal, 5(2),* 81-94.

Sellnow, T.L. (1989). Proving it in impromptu speaking: A description of supporting examples used by impromptu speakers. *The Forensic, 77*, 1-5.

Understanding Lincoln Douglas Debate

Audra R. Diers, Mesa State College

Webmaster's Note – The URL for the NFA-LD website was changed to reflect a permanent link.

Abstract

This paper offers an overview to NFA Lincoln-Douglas debate, highlighting elements of the event making it unique, discussing the primary judging criteria, and offering an overview to case and position structuring. The central assumptions taken in this analysis of the event are: (1) that the event emphasizes both substance and style and (2) that good argumentation is straight-forward and grounded in clarity of structure and evidence. Taken together this analysis is designed to not only offer an understanding of the event for those not yet familiar with it, but to highlight some of the central issues and points of contention in the event's development.

The central goals of NFA Lincoln-Douglas (LD) debate emphasize the development of competitors' "analysis, use of evidence, and ability to effectively and persuasively organize, deliver, and refute arguments" (NFA LD Homepage). LD's founders believed that if they created a strong mission and set of rules, they would be able to lay the foundation for an event that blended the research and refutation skills of traditional debate with the strength of delivery for which individual events are renowned (Minch & Borchers, 1996). While the veracity and validity of these rules is often debated within the LD community, they are what make NFA LD unique. The mission and rules distinguish it from other forms of academic debate in that LD has a clearly proscribed judging paradigm; whereas other forms of debate allow an ad hoc application of judging standards in rounds. Furthermore, Devine (1997) argues that the narrowing of appropriate judging paradigms and approaches in LD offers the event a greater level of consistency in terms of the evaluation of proof and structure so that the debaters can focus more effectively on arguments themselves and affords the event a greater level of accessibility as a result.

These elements make LD distinctive, yet complementary with other forms of debate. For example, Parliamentary Debate—as developed by the members of the National Parliamentary Debate Association—emphasizes audience-centered debate. Thus, in terms of developing an event that emphasizes delivery and persuasion LD and "Parli" are quite complementary. However, whereas competing and coaching in Parli requires a broad based of knowledge across current events, philosophy, history, and the like, LD asks competitors to develop a deep level of knowledge about a single topic in a given year—explicating the contemporary research, critiquing it in depth, as well as developing and modifying individual arguments as they are exposed to refutation and feedback. This depth of knowledge on a single topic is what LD and team styles of debate such as CEDA and NDT (as they are presently practiced) have in common. However, because there is only one person on each side and LD mandates both research/refutation and delivery/persuasion it means that in LD the debaters must limit the numbers of

positions and amount of evidence read in a single round. In this way LD is a viable option for: programs competing in these styles of debate but wanting to supplement their competition; for individual events programs wanting to develop the research and refutation skills required by LD; and also for programs that want to focus their resources on a single event that has the potential for the delivery and style of many individual events, asks for the norms of audience adaptation found in Parli, and the research skills found in team debate.

Though the application of the Stock Issues paradigm has long been questioned in LD, recent empirical findings by Birkholt and Diers (in press) found judges in elimination rounds of LD at the national tournament communicated reasons consistent with the Stock Issues paradigm in their rationales for decision, though elements of other paradigms—most notably the Policy Maker, Critical Listener, and Dialectical Perspective were also present in their communication of decision. Ultimately these findings suggest that the founders have been successful in laying the foundation for an event that emphasizes the research and refutation skills of traditional debate with an emphasis on delivery and persuasion. Therefore, to offer an overview to LD, its central positions, and structures, I will: (1) briefly discuss the decision criteria that should be used by debaters and critics alike and (2) overview effective case and position structuring in the event.

The Decision Criteria in NFA LD Debate

The decision criteria in LD can be separated into three complementary components. The first is the evaluation of a round of debate's substance—the Stock Issues paradigm. The second is the evaluation of debaters' style in the round. Finally, we do have to consider the LD critics' responsibilities in the round of debate.

The Stock Issues Paradigm

The Stock Issues paradigm for decision making in policy debate is the oldest and most "traditional" set of criteria for the evaluation of competitive debate. Because of its ties to classic persuasion theory, the paradigm assumes that people are not likely to change from the "known" and more comfortable status quo without a substantial indictment to that status quo and proposal of a specific and solvent plan of action (Ericson & Murphy, 1987). Ulrich (1992) points out that the stock issues paradigm suggests that there are basic responsibilities that any advocate of a change in policy must face to effectively justify the proposed change.

The five central responsibilities developed in the NFA Stock Issues paradigm include: topicality, significant harm, an inherent barrier to change, the inclusion of a specific plan, the solvency of the harm or comparative advantage gained by the enactment of the plan, and as an option counterplans for the negative. First, the NFA LD Stock Issues paradigm requires that affirmative proposals be topical. This refers to the jurisdiction of the judge to actually listen to the debate as well as the affirmative's ability to fall within the parameters of the res-

olution (Minch & Borchers, 1996; Patterson & Zarefsky, 1983; Ulrich, 1992). Second, the affirmative must show a significant harm to the status quo, representing the credible reason to be dissatisfied with existing policies (Minch & Borchers, 1986; Ulrich, 1992). Third, in addition to showing that the status quo is deficient, the affirmative must also prove that there is a barrier that, absent a policy change, prevents the status quo from correcting itself—this is known as inherency (Birkholt, 1999; Minch & Borchers, 1996; Ulrich, 1992). Fourth, after the affirmative provides a specific plan to change the current system, s/he must demonstrate the ability of the proposed plan to eliminate or reduce the harms and/or accrue a substantial advantage; essentially this is a demonstration of the degree of cure projected to come from the plan proposal (Minch & Borchers, 1996). This fourth element includes both questions of solvency and desirability articulated by Ulrich (1992) in his discussion of the traditional Stock Issues paradigm. Fifth, the negative is permitted to offer a counter proposal (i.e., a counterplan). This alternative proposal must be competitive (i.e., solve the same harms as the affirmative proposal), have a comparative advantage to the affirmative proposal, and may not be topical (so that the negative is still negating the resolution) (Minch & Borchers, 1996; NFA LD Homepage). This element is a little different because it is not required, rather is allowed.

Evaluation of a Debate's Style in LD

Because LD identifies itself as being part of an Individual Events community and because the founders wanted to lay a foundation for the event to emphasize persuasion and an appealing style in delivery, NFA LD includes a compelling delivery as a critical part of the judging process (Minch & Borchers, 1996, NFA LD Homepage). Outside of a specific provision against rapid-fire delivery (NFA LD Homepage), there is little qualification of what it means to have a compelling delivery. Bile (1996) argues that LD, "has significantly expanded opportunities for students to experience the benefits of educational debate... unfortunately...[it] has failed to realize its full pedagogical potential...part of this failure can be attributed to ambiguities in the current rules" (p. 37). As such, he lays out the Dialectical Perspective specifically as a way to adjudicate rounds of NFA LD. The strength and value of this perspective is that it offers specific criteria on which a compelling delivery may be evaluated in rounds. As such it is an ideal complement to the evaluation of the substance of the round and Stock Issues Paradigm.

Bile (1996) argues that we should not view a debate round as a "war of words," rather; we should consider the relationship—within the debate context—of the participants (i.e., judge and debaters). Bile (1996) therefore proposes four specific evaluative criterion and four meta-philosophies to be used in the evaluation of and communication about the debate round. The first evaluative criterion is cooperation, which focuses on the debaters' ability to conform to appropriate rules and norms of the event (Bile, 1996). The second criterion is comprehensiveness, which asks whether the debaters have dealt with the subject matter as thor-

oughly as possible (Bile, 1996). Third, the arguments should be candid meaning that they are made clearly so that they are more open for examination and critique (Bile, 1996). Finally, Bile argues that debaters should be evaluated on their critical skills, that is, their use of the most rigorous tests of the positions presented that is possible.

Underlying these four evaluative criteria are four meta-issues that Bile (1996) suggests should also inform the decision making process and be communicated on written ballots. First, the evaluation of debates ought to integrate delivery and content issues into a single evaluative framework. Second, judges and debaters should be viewed as partners in the decision making process because without all three individuals, there could be no debate. Third, judges should reward friendly, respectful, and productive exchanges between debaters. Fourth, debaters should be evaluated on holistic argumentation. Finally, Bile argues that the decision itself should be made holistically. Therefore, in the evaluation of the round, there should be a focus on the round as a whole, not what is done is particular speeches, rather across the debate.

Critics' Responsibilities in Rounds of LD

Before I discuss the responsibilities of critics in rounds of LD, the discussion to this point has suggested two central assumptions about the nature of decision making in NFA LD. First, as an event that focuses on research and refutation skills while emphasizing delivery and persuasion the debaters ought to debate with both technique and style—being evaluated accordingly. Second, when evaluating rounds of debate there is a duality of responsibility; because the event is built on an interaction between the debaters and with the critic (Bile, 1996), over the course of the round the competitors have a responsibility to adapt to each other and the critic. However, the critic ought to also adapt to the norms of the event.

Taken together these assumptions about the evaluation process suggest that the central responsibility for an LD critic is to evaluate LD qua LD. This is an assumption made in other forms of individual events competition; for example, we would not expect the same types of evaluative criteria or methods to reach a critical decision to be applied to poetry as is applied to informative speaking. Bierch (2001) argues that to be an effective listener, the listener ought to demonstrate that they are listening and understanding the speaker in terms appropriate to the setting. Moreover, Bierch (2001) argues that speakers who think they are being listened to effectively are better able to develop their analysis simply because they feel they are being treated fairly. This supports Bile's (1996) argument that debate ballots ought to reflect the evaluation of a whole round rather than particular speeches, along with the aforementioned criteria for effective debate ballots.

The most effective way for a judge to begin to evaluate LD qua LD is to 'flow' or keep linear notes on the progression of the round. Proper flowing of debate rounds means that in a quick glance at his or her notes, a critic should be

able to see the progression of a single argument across the entire round of debate. This more effectively allows the critic to comment effectively on technique, adaptation, and delivery issues as they related to the arguments made in the round. Flowing also helps judges to more effectively evaluate the round based on arguments made in the round, not necessarily truths they "know" or believe to be that are not made in the debate round. The other critical step in evaluating LD qua LD is for the critic to incorporate their own strengths and backgrounds into comments on style and argument development, while leaving evaluative criteria from other events they coach, judge, and/or have competed in out of the decision. Therefore, by flowing and evaluating rounds of debate only on criteria established for NFA LD competitors can more fairly adapt to the nuances of preference held by individual critics while still being able to compete effectively in their event.

Effective Case and Position Structuring

Because rounds of NFA LD should be evaluated based on a Stock Issues Paradigm and arguments evaluated for both their substance and style as the Dialectical Perspective suggests, there are ways in which cases and positions should be structured to effectively debate in the context of NFA LD. As such, in this section I will offer overviews to the effective and appropriate construction of many of the primary positions necessary in LD and briefly discuss some of the central challenges and contemporary issues related to position structures.

Structuring Effective Positions

Because other forms of debate do not focus their evaluative criteria for the substance of a round of debate on solely the Stock Issues paradigm and because there are typically four constructive speeches across the debate, there are often many types of case and position structures that can be effective and appropriate to those debate rounds. However, that is simply not the case in NFA LD. In discussing the structure of effective positions, I will not address the structure of every possible position; rather I will focus my discussion on the most positions central to LD: case construction, the development of topicality, disadvantages, and on-case front line argumentation. My discussion is based on a single assumption coming from over a decade of involvement in the event as a debater, coach, judge, and researcher—good debate is not about being tricky in the development of positions, it is about creating straight-forward positions that highlight the debater's strength of the research, analysis, and delivery.

Affirmative case construction. There are two affirmative case construction structures that are effective and appropriate in NFA LD debate. First is the "plan-meet-need" structure. In the first contention the affirmative establishes the "significant and inherent harm in the status quo for change." Given the time and emphasis on a conversational-style delivery, the debater will have time for approximately three to four pieces of evidence. This means that a good piece of

evidence—while perhaps emphasizing the description of the problem, degree to which this is affecting particular populations, or reasons why the present system is unable to change—ought to have components of all three elements to establish an effective harms story. Done well, the evidence selected for this first contention will afford an affirmative the basis for any arguments necessary in refutation of negative attacks and summary of the problem in rebuttals. The second component to the plan-meet-need case structure in LD is clearly establishing the proposed plan of action. Plans need not be overly detailed, but need to provide the specific provisions that will enable the plan to solve the harms. The final component in LD's plan-meet-need structure is solvency. Again, choosing three to four effective pieces of evidence, the solvency must directly relate to the provisions of the plan and solve each of the harms described in the first contention. A helpful way to structure the solvency contention is to make sure that each of the pieces of solvency evidence parallels the harms evidence. Like the harms evidence, good solvency evidence should provide all the details that afford the affirmative clear and concise refutation to attacks and rebuttal.

The second case construction structure appropriate to NFA LD is the "comparative advantage" case. This structure contends that the proposed affirmative plan offers important advantages to the status quo. In the first observation of the case, the affirmative needs to construct the inherent barrier to change in the status quo. This should be done with one or perhaps two pieces of effective and clear evidence citing specific reasons why the present system has failed to adopt change. Immediately following is the affirmative's plan-following the same guidelines as discussed in the plan—meet-need structure. The remainder of the case structure focuses on advantages. Because of LD's substance and style issues, an affirmative is typically only going to be able to construct two and perhaps three effective advantages to the plan. Advantage structure begins with one or two effective pieces of evidence indicating the nature of the significant harm in the present system. The following one or two effective pieces of evidence specifically indicate how the plan will offer a comparative advantage to addressing the harms in the status quo. In order to be effective, comparative advantage cases should have more than one advantage.

Topicality. Topicality is often one of the most frustrating positions run in NFA LD—regardless of whether it is topicality, effects topicality, or extra topicality—because it is often poorly structured. A poorly structured position leads to poor debate on the issue. There is a **single** effective and appropriate structure that should be used when constructing any topicality position. The structure, in the appropriate order of presentation is: standards; followed by the test of topicality, if there is one proposed by the standards (this is certainly not a requirement of effective topicality positions, but is often useful); violation of the standards; and impact. There are several reasons—despite some current practices—that this is the only appropriate structure for topicality arguments, each of which has to do with the function of the necessary components.

First, the standards establish the "theory" as to what it means to be topical in any particular round of debate. Standards typically include definitions of terms

as well as concrete evaluative criteria for the judge to be able to decide whether a particular affirmative plan is within the jurisdiction of the resolution; thus enabling them to enact it if it is beneficial. The topicality violation is simply an argument that an affirmative plan is not topical based on standards presented. Without standards established first, these violation arguments are weakened because they are not contextualized for the critic. Effective standards are those that give objective and clear criteria on which a judge may evaluate the topicality of an affirmative plan. Ineffective standards, such as "reasonability" or "fairness", offer vague criteria that essentially ask for a judge to intervene with his or her own opinion of plans that may or may not be topical.

If a negative has proposed that the best way to test whether or not an affirmative plan is topical is by offering a test of the topicality, which is the second component to the topicality position that must be established. Tests for topicality must come before the violation because they, like the standards, establish the objective criteria on which the argument for the violation is built.

Once the criteria for evaluating a plan's topicality have been established, the negative should offer the argument(s) indicating why the affirmative's plan has violated the jurisdiction granted by the resolution to develop plans of action. Good violations analysis directly and specifically applies the standards (and test) of topicality to the affirmative plan in order to concretely demonstrate the affirmative has failed to meet his or her prima facie burden of proposing a plan within the jurisdiction of the resolution, thus affirming the resolution.

The final element that needs to be included are the implications of the topicality violation in the round. Because different types of topicality have different implications, these need to be clearly and specifically delineated by the negative. Essentially, this element of topicality is the debater's specific request for action to the judge in the round.

Disadvantages. While helpful in the opposition of an affirmative's plan, they ought not be considered necessary. However, if the negative argues that the affirmative plan, if put into action, will create disadvantages s/he should make sure that it has link, uniqueness to plan, and clear negative impacts. Little, outside of excessive use of topicality, perplexes critics more than excessively generic disadvantages that they see run far too frequently. Effective disadvantages are specific to cases/plans or case areas. This means that the first component is an effective link of the disadvantage to the affirmative case. This may be made with strong analysis and/or an effective piece of evidence specific to the case or case area. A second component to an effective disadvantage is the degree to which a disadvantage is unique to the affirmative plan. This is most often an argument made by the negative to establish why the disadvantage ought to be given weight against the affirmative's plan versus all other possible plans. Finally, effective disadvantages in LD must have impacts that outweigh advantages or benefits that the affirmative is trying to claim.

On-case front line attacks. The final and most under used type of position in NFA LD are on-case front line attacks against the case based on any of the other stock issues. These positions may apply to specific pieces of evidence

within an affirmative case or entire contentions. These positions should also have a clear structure in order to be effective. This structure should be used not only in the construction of negative front line attacks, but effective responses to arguments made against a portion of case or position run in a round of debate. This is based on classic rebuttal structure. The debater should: (1) clearly identify the specific argument being attacked; (2) make a clear, concise, and specific claim in refutation of the case or position; (3) concisely explain the claim; (4) offer support for the claim—the can certainly be direct evidence in refutation of the point, but solid analysis can also function as effective support for the claim; and (5) the debater needs to place an impact on the argument—indicating what this argument means in the context of the round.

Central Challenges Related to Position Structures

Each of these position structures offered represents an ideal based on the needs and constraints of argumentation in NFA LD. These are however, not without challenges or controversy in current practice. There are three central challenges in contemporary practice related to position structures.

Evidence placement and use. The first of these challenges or issues is evidence placement and use. The needs of the event and decision criteria—based on a combination of substance and style—call for LD to be a straight-forward substantive debate. However, the use of evidence and its placement sometimes creates a challenge to this goal. In order to adequately discuss and develop issues in a single constructive speech per side of the debate, a debater ought to place his or her strongest pieces of evidence in the case itself or front-lines of any positions. Unfortunately, debaters often believe that they can be strategic by saving their best pieces of evidence for rebuttals. Aside from fostering bad debate, it does not push the debaters to use their analytical skills to effectively argue why their position is the best position in the round—rather it makes them overly reliant on reading additional evidence in their rebuttal(s). When debaters fail to place their best evidence in their cases or front-line positions, it almost always means that they must spend their time in the rebuttal rebuilding their case or position with pieces of evidence rather than offering solid analysis to explain why their opposition's position is inferior or does not have nearly as significant of impacts, etc. The result is inferior quality debates and a lack of emphasis on good analysis.

Topicality. Topicality itself is often a challenge in debate because judges feel they want to hear substantive debate and often articulate that topicality debate seems to take away from substance. I believe this is an evaluation of the issue rising from poorly constructed topicality positions and over-use of topicality positions. Issues that contribute to this tension about topicality include: (1) the use of poor standards, such as reasonability and fairness, that take the issue away from a concrete test of the plan's ability to fall within the boundaries of the resolution; (2) on some topics—such as welfare reform for the 2002-2003 season-where there were almost infinite numbers of topical, although somewhat predictable, cases and the sheer number of cases that were simply not topical

forced negative debaters to argue the issue most rounds; (3) a lack of innovation in the objective or concrete ways to test an affirmative plan's topicality; and (4) an emergent trend to structure topicality improperly placing the standards after the violations which only serves to weaken and obfuscate the issue for judges.

Abuse as argument against cases and positions. There is one particularly disturbing trend in the practice of NFA LD that takes away from both the substance and style of the debate. All too often in recent years debaters have used "abuse" standards as measures for the evaluation of cases, topicality, disadvantages, and other positions. The affirmative or negative's abuse of a research burden has never been and will never be an appropriate reason for a judge to accept or reject a position in a debate round. For instance, when an affirmative proposes a non-topical plan, the reason a judge should vote against the plan is not because it 'places an unfair research burden on the negative', it is because the plan's actions lie outside of the authority of the judge granted by virtue of the resolution. Simply put, the judge may not enact a plan that s/he is not allowed to enact. Often these abuse-based arguments are supplemented with the following rationale, "I could not have possibly predicted this particular argument would be run in this round." If the position refuted with the abuse analysis lies within the jurisdiction of the resolution, then what this argument communicates is that the debater making the argument failed to research effectively before the tournament—nothing more, nothing less.

Conclusion

NFA LD is a valuable event for both debate-only and mixed squads because it blends the research, argumentation, and refutation of traditional forms of debate with the style and excellence in communication developed by Individual Events. When performed and evaluated effectively, the event uses a Stock Issues model for evaluating the substance of the arguments presented in the round in combination with a critical evaluation of the style with which the arguments are developed and delivered. I have argued in this paper that applying both the Stock Issues Paradigm and Bile's (1996) Dialectal Perspective is an effective way to understand and actively apply LD's mission and event goals. Furthermore, I have highlighted effective case and position structures for some of the primary positions argued in rounds of LD—demonstrating the elements that are necessary to maintain the balance between substance and style, and highlighting some of the challenges and contemporary issues relevant to those structures. In the final analysis, what makes any event great is achieving a balance of substance and style—when performed and evaluated well, LD offers both pedagogical and competitive excellence, adding an important component to the National Forensics Association's events offerings.

References

Bierch, R. (2001). How to listen. *Harvard Management Communication Letter*, 4(1)4-5.

Bile, J. T. (1996). Propositional focus in dialectical perspective: A call for greater consistency in the theory of NFA Lincoln-Douglas Debate. *National Forensic Journal, 14(2),* 37-59.

Birkholt, M. J., & Diers, A. R. (2004). Judging Philosophy: Reflected in the Communication of Judge's Decisions in NFA Lincoln Douglas Debate. *National Forensic Journal, 22(2),* 1-22.

Birkholt, M. (1999). The influence of judging paradigm on critic decision-making in Lincoln-Douglas Debate. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Communication Association, Chicago, IL.

Devine, J. M. (1997). Developing functional standards as a means to greater accessibility in NFA-LD. In S. Whitney (Ed.). Proceedings of the Third National Developmental Conference on Individual Events, Houston, TX. pp. (35-38).

Ericson, J. M., & Murphy, J. J. (1987). *The Debater's Guide: Revised Edition.* Carbondale, IL: Southern University Press.

Minch, K., & Borchers, T. A. (1996). A philosophy for judging NFA Lincoln-Douglas Debate. *National Forensic Journal, 14(2),* 19-36.

National Forensics Association (1995). *Rules of Competition for NFA Lincoln-Douglas Debate.* National Forensics Association Homepage. (2001) http://www.nationalforensics.org/nfa-ld.html.

Patterson, J. W. & Zarefsky, D. (1983). *Contemporary Debate.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Ulrich, W. (1992). The stock issues paradigm. In D. A. Thomas & J. P. Hart (Eds.), *Advanced Debate: Readings in Theory Practice and Teaching* (pp. 245-251). Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.

Decoding Forensics Slang

Charles Parrott, Clemson University

Abstract

One way in which long-time coaches attempt to simplify forensics dialogue is through forensic slang. Whether it be acronyms, jargon, or other abbreviations, a new coach may feel lost when presented with terminology that is foreign to them. This article aims to alleviate that stress by helping explain how forensics shorthand equates to forensics longhand.

A former forensic student of mine once noted that forensics outsiders would be perplexed at the language that we use. As an example he noted that if, "you say that you broke your POI, people wonder, 'why do we hurt fish?" A joke, yes, but the best jokes are based in truth. It has been previously acknowledged that forensics enjoys its own special kind of language. "Forensics lingo," as it is referred to here, can be a valuable part of forensic culture but can also cause confusion and division when it is misunderstood and overused. The purpose of this essay is to provide a limited overview of terminology and slang terms common in forensic competition, particularly individual events. For new coaches, the need to understand the terminology associated with competitive forensics is significant as they are about to be immersed in a culture that, indeed, has it's own language. Perhaps the surest sign of sub-cultural membership is the ability to skillfully navigate the jargon and terminology that surrounds that subculture. An inability to interpret and utilize these terms can make an individual feel out of place and ineffectual when in contexts related to the subculture in question. This essay merely provides the broadest stroke of the terminological brush in discussing the utility of forensics lingo and providing a list of terms commonly used in individual events.

Utility of Forensics Lingo

The world of competitive forensics has spawned a large vocabulary of terms that serve several purposes. These terms can be inherently subdivide into three categories: (a) acronyms, (b) abbreviated terms, and (c) genuine slang terms which have risen out of competition.

Many terms are acronyms that act as a kind of shorthand for common yet cumbersome words and phrases. For instance, the American Forensics Association National Individual Events Tournament is more than a mouthful, while AFA-NIET us far less unwieldy. Further, abbreviated terms help facilitate the quick exchange of ideas that unique to competitive individual events. For example, a performer who competes most often or most successfully in oral interpretation events may be known as "an interper." The proper word in this case would be "interpreter" but it is disregarded in favor of the shortened term. A third category exists in the form of genuine slang terms that have grown out of indi-

vidual events participation. For example, speakers who appear too prepared in limited preparation events may be accused of having "canned" speeches, or broad speeches prepared ahead of time to fit multiple topics/occasions. The need to labeled these speeches "canned speeches" could only happen in an activity that strictly demands an impromptu or extemporaneous style in some events. Outside of forensics its seems unlikely that such a distinction would be important to an audience. Furthermore, these categories often intersect. For example, the interpretation event Program of Oral Interpretation, is often spoken as the three letters P-O-I. It is just as often spoken as if the three letters were themselves a word, "Pu-oi" which could be considered a slang term.

Through the understanding of why and how slang and abbreviations are used within the forensic world, one is now ready to immerse themselves in some prime examples. Below is a list of key terms/abbreviations that you will likely find within the forensic subculture.

Term	*Definition*
AFA	American Forensics Association. One of the national sanctioning bodies in forensics. Sponsors one of the national tournaments we attend, called the American Forensics Association National Individual Events Tournament or AFA-NIET.
Awards	Refers to the awards ceremony (not necessarily the prizes themselves) that follows each tournament. This is where final round rankings are revealed and trophies are given out.
Ballots	Documents filled out by judges in rounds at tournaments. They include a rank in the round for each speaker and a point rating as well. The NFA (see NFA) point system runs from 100 to 70 and the AFA (see AFA) point system runs from 25 to 1. Ballots also include constructive criticism and reasons for the judge's decision, often referred to as the "RFD."
Black Book/ Interp Book	Small black three ringed binders used to contain manuscripts for all interpretative events. No rule requires that students hold their manuscripts in a binder, yet students predominantly do.
Break	Advancing to final rounds is commonly known as "breaking" to finals.
Canned Speeches	An abstract concept related to limited preparation events. It refers to preparing a detailed version of the entire speech ahead of time rather than preparing it on the spot. An unethical practice and a serious accusation to make.

Crit / C.A.	Slang terms for the events rhetorical criticism and communication analysis. The same speeches compete in the event regardless of what name is used to designate it. AFA offers communication analysis and NFA offers rhetorical criticism.
Cumes	Short hand for documents that contain the ranks and rates accumulated by each competitor through out a particular tournament.
DI	An acronym for dramatic interpretation. This is an event that is only offered, on a national level, at the AFA-N1ET. It is a cutting from a play, television or film script, radio play, or dramatic monologue, which may or may not be "dramatic" or serious in nature.
Districts	A tournament hosted once a year by each AFA district. Each state belongs to an AFA district. For example, most of the south is in District 6 while the high plains are in District 4. The district tournament provides and opportunity for an automatic qualification for the AFA-NIET (American Forensics Association National Individual Events Tournament).
D.O.F. /A.D.O.F. / D.O.I.E./ D.O.D.	Director of forensics and assistant director of forensics and director of individual events and director of debate. These are the coaches, instructors, and faculty that are appointed by the department or institution to administrate the forensics program.
Double Entered / Triple Entered / Quad Entered	When a competitor has more than one round to compete in at a particular time they are one of the above. A DE, TE, or QE indicates this after the competitor's name when they sign into the round. Being DE or the like may move you up sooner in the order of the round. Occasionally, someone will sign in with an XE after their name meaning "Cross entered" which is the same as being double entered.
Finals	Refers to final rounds at any given tournament. Competitors must get high rankings in preliminary rounds to advance to final rounds. Generally, finals are comprised of the top six competitors in a particular event at a particular tournament.

Golden Leg	If a competitor is left out of finals or off of postings, and thus out of a final round, when they should have been included, they receive a golden leg or golden 1, which means they receive credit as if they had won the event in which they should have made finals. This is not announced but made clear by reading the cumes. This only of real importance to students attempting to qualify for the AFA-N1ET.
Hired Judges	Former competitors, faculty, or other people who have offered to judge at a tournament. These people are not coaches but their opinion and impression of a performance is treated with the same weight as any other critic.
lEs	Acronym for individual events. This includes all of the public speaking, limited preparation, and interpretive events. Debate styles are not individual events, even when they only feature one debater competing against another, such as Lincoln Douglas Debate.
Leg(s)	These are rankings received overall at any given tournament in a particular event. Three legs that add up to eight or less must be received to qualify for the American Forensics Association National Individual Events Tournament (AFA-NIET).
Lit	Shorthand for literature that is performed in interpretative events.
NFA	National Forensics Association. One of the national sanctioning bodies for forensics. Host of the National Forensic Association Championships.
Out Rounds	Particularly relevant at national tournaments, out rounds refer to elimination rounds such as quarterfinals or semi-finals.
Parli	Shorthand for parliamentary debate. This value driven two-person debate is offered at many IE tournaments.
POI	Program of oral interpretation also known as "program" in some circles. It involves constructing a program of literature under a particular theme. This event is only offered on the national level at the American Forensics Association National Individual Events Tournament (AFA-NIET).

Postings	Large visual displays that list the finalists in each event. Looking at postings is the only way to know for sure if you have advanced to final rounds in a particular event.
Prelims	Shorthand for preliminary rounds of competition. Ranks and rates in prelims determine who advances to out-rounds or finals.
Quals	Shorthand for national qualifications. Generally referring to the number of events that have qualified for a national tournament. Note: a number of variations are possible such as an event that just broke being referred to as having just "qualed."
Slicks	Small page protectors with a black background used to contain manuscripts held in interp books.
Tab Sheets	See "cumes" above.
VAs	An acronym for visual aids. These are large visual depictions of something that appears in a public address speech. VAs demand the use of a large VA case and a VA stand, or easel.

Conclusion

The above list is a very limited organization of terms that surround and permeate participation in individual events. Furthermore, many of these terms may quickly become outdated or may be undecipherable to coaches and competitors in another region. Nonetheless, 1 contend that the use of these terms has a distinct set of values.

First, I use a customized version of the above list to familiarize novices with terminology of individual events. It has been my experience that students feel much more a part of the activity when they are able to use its language. It can be a very effective tool for new coaches and students to have a glossary terms to help navigate future forensics participation.

Second, while the use of forensics lingo can make an individual feel connected to the activity it can also build a sense of community within the activity. When forensics lingo is exchanged between competitors it reinforces the importance of the activity for both participants. It allows groups of students to identify with one another because they share the same language.

Some coaches and critics cringe at the sound of shorthand and slang to describe the various facets of forensics. I would encourage them to embrace the use of forensics lingo for all of the positive benefits it can bring to participation in the activity.

Coroners, We Are Not: Getting the Word Out Through Publicity and Recruitment

David Moscowitz, Wabash College

Abstract

Describing and characterizing a well established Aristotelian term like "forensics" offers the possibility of sharing a rich pedagogical tradition, one that works toward enhancing our collective ability to communicate with one another. Essential to the health of this tradition is the promotion of what we do. Getting the word out about co-curricular forensics activities involves garnering publicity for our endeavors and attracting other engaged students to participate in these activities. By elaborating different ways of getting the word out, this essay develops three values, accessibility, community, and involvement, which characterize the process of garnering effective publicity and recruitment.

One question from the uninitiated that has become a well-worn joke implicates frequent confusion about the meaning of "forensics." Many of us on the "circuit" have fielded various renditions of this question such as "Do you investigate dead people?" "Do you practice lab science?" and "Is that like on *C.S.I.?"*

The question is both unfortunate and potentially productive. It reflects how, in a culture dominated by intercollegiate athletics, co-curricular competition in debate and IE (another term that requires explanation) usually resides in the shadows of football, basketball, and even field hockey. Nevertheless, explaining the etymology of a well established Aristotelian term like "forensics" offers the possibility of sharing a rich pedagogical tradition, one that works toward enhancing our collective ability to communicate with one another. Essential to the health of this tradition is our promotion of what we do, how it's done, and why we do it. Forensics attracts students who are talented, curious, reflective, and creative, and it is important that their efforts are appreciated by others. Getting the word out involves garnering publicity for these endeavors, which fosters attracting other engaged students into these activities.

Seeking publicity for an emergent forensics program demands attention to three values that characterize what we do: accessibility, community, and involvement. These values position forensics programs to grow, gain greater respect, and encourage others to get involved. The first step to garnering recognition is to be in and at those places where people will look. In other words, your program should be accessible to those who are looking for you. Every team that I have worked with has included students who sought us out on their own. How did these industrious students do this? They searched for us on the web, they contacted related academic departments, and they went to student organization or activities offices on campus. Generating a web site from scratch may sound like an arduous task, but it can benefit a start-up program in innumerable ways. Check to see if your university or college offers server allotment for co-curricular organ-

izations like your program. If it doesn't, check to see if an academic program or department will sponsor you if only to the extent of getting an ".edu" address for your program. Once you have attained some space on the web, do a search for other programs and check out their sites. Ask yourself the kinds of questions you'll need to tackle: How do they characterize their program? What kinds of audiences are addressed? How are the site's links organized? What kind of relationship to the university is projected? You should also seek out programs at colleges close to you. Ask your peers how they use their web sites or why they haven't (yet) produced one. I have used the web to offer not only contact and meeting information (where we're located on campus, where and when and how often we meet), but also to promote our accomplishments and justify our role on campus. Your web site can address not only current, past, and potential team members but also those who are simply curious about what you do. For those folks looking for you, the web will inevitably be one of the first places they will search.

There are two other important resources that ensure your accessibility. First develop a relationship with an academic program that will appreciate what you do. If you derive your funding in this way, then you're probably in good shape. If you instead get funding from a variety of sources related to student activity fees, it is still important to be recognized and appreciated by like departments oriented around rhetoric, speech, communication(s), and/or theatre. A department may not only field inquiries about your presence on campus, it also might constitute a source for help with recruiting. Contact instructors of public speaking and let them know that you're interested in referrals, students who might benefit from the resources offered by this activity. Building good bonds between curricular programs and co-curricular activities like yours that reflect their values and offer a venue for experiential learning can produce mutual benefits for each other. Also be sure that your program is registered with your campus's office of student activities or organizations. At many schools, all student organizations get listed on the web; your listing could be hyperlinked to your new web site providing another means of access. Likewise, at many schools, offices devoted to student activities offer promotional opportunities for upcoming events and organize fairs that promote student organizations at the beginning of the school year. For those people seeking you out, a student activities office is a logical place to start.

Once you have planted the seeds that ensure your accessibility, it is time to become more proactive and establish a positive presence in your campus and civic communities. Remember those relationships you developed with departments and public speaking instructors in particular? See which instructors are interested in having your students speak, debate, or perform for various classes-Impromptu and extemporaneous speaking are often popular, for example, along with basic speech genres such as informative and persuasive. Peers who demonstrate public speaking in class can offer a valuable complement to watching famous speeches from the past on video. In addition to classroom participation, consider organizing events on campus such as public debates of exigent issues and showcase performances for not only your campus but also the community at large. Some instructors might offer extra credit to students who attend these

events. These events not only offer the opportunity to generate publicity for what you do, they also give your students new contexts and audiences for their own speeches and performances. In addition to performances, you and/or your students also could pursue instructional roles that generate positive recognition. Consider organizing workshops devoted to reducing communication apprehension or preparing for job interviews. Students involved in your program also could pursue related activities such as poetry slams or a speakers' corner on campus devoted to discussing issues of the day. Finding ways to give back to your community can not only get more students involved and aware of what you do, but also generate press coverage and positive word of mouth around campus and the community.

When you establish a strong role in your community, you begin to assert positions of leadership and involvement. In particular, consider your program's relationship to and involvement in other publicity-generating organizations such as the campus newspaper, yearbook, and student government. At Indiana University, the program has benefited from students who have excelled in these activities. We have had stories recounting state and national tournaments as well as tournaments we have hosted on campus placed prominently in the campus newspaper. Sometimes, these stories get reproduced in the paper's welcome back edition targeted to incoming students at the beginning of the school year. We also were the subject of a feature article that spanned several pages in a recent yearbook because of student involvement. When a member of our team was elected student body president, his identity as a leader of the team also was noted frequently. This kind of free press often engenders itself. Write your own press releases after significant tournaments and events and place them on your team's web site. Better yet, appoint or elect a student to be the team's PR officer and have that person direct attention to these press releases and events. Once your newspaper or yearbook has validated your program's achievements, you may be surprised at how this attention can snowball. During my first year coaching at Bradley University, I saw how our "Night Before Nationals" showcase performances had become a campus tradition that had expanded to several nights, packed audiences, and attention from not only the campus newspaper but also the city's as well. Generating and growing free press like this can be much more compelling than simply placing—and paying for—advertising that gets buried on the inside pages.

In addition to getting involved in your campus and civic communities, consider how to get recognition in high school forensics communities as well. One of the most compelling sources of recruiting is the high school "pipeline," those students who already know forensics to an extent and are eager to continue participating in college. The biggest and most successful programs recruit from this pipeline aggressively, particularly those that offer scholarship assistance. No matter your program's size and resources, however, you can take steps in this direction. Although they can become large endeavors that require a lot of time, consider hosting a high school tournament or summer camp on campus. Seek out your school's office of admissions and offices devoted to summer programs and

recruitment. My experiences in this regard have varied, but you may find that your school is eager to help with both financial and people resources. Try to use these opportunities to get to know high school coaches as well. Learn about how they approach the activity, what values they try to impart to their students, and how they coach and manage their own programs. One concern on the minds of both high school and college coaches is how students who are motivated to continue competing adapt to this transition. It won't take long for high school coaches to recognize and appreciate your interest in how students grow and adjust to intercollegiate forensics. Like with the public speaking instructors, referrals in this regard can be fruitful and enduring.

Getting the word out and generating publicity is not always easy and demands time and effort. Like anything else with a start-up program, however, it can be extremely rewarding. It also will become much easier if you sow the kinds of seeds that perpetuate their own publicity and recruiting. By making your presence known and accessible to outsiders, playing a positive role and contributing to your various communities, and then getting more involved in related organizations and contexts, you can generate the kind of recognition that not only feeds good recruiting, but also provides the kind of respect and appreciation that your students deserve. People should know that enhancing communication is what you and your program are all about, not seeing dead people.

The Art of Establishing a Practical Practice Schedule

Mary Moore, Ball State University

Abstract

This essay explores the benefits and drawbacks of four different coaching approaches: (a) standardized weekly coaching sessions, (b) variable weekly sessions, (c) standardized team practice times, and (d) come when you want. Each one of these organizational strategies is reviewed in relation to (a) the size and expertise of coaching staff, (b) team size, and (c) program goals. Additionally, it briefly discusses approaches toward peer coaching and length of coaching sessions.

Some of my favorite memories as a forensicator are of coaching sessions. Whether it was my teammate teaching me how to dance like a stripper as we washed our jeans at the local laundromat (an act that I never quite mastered), or a late afternoon session with my coach where we spent an hour and half perfecting the introduction to my persuasion, I always found coaching sessions to be an interesting mix of fun and learning. These moments helped shape me as the educator and coach I am today. The expression, that the key to success is practice, practice, practice is never truer than in forensics. Coaching is the foundation of both the educational and competitive goals of our activity. One-on-one sessions allow students and coaches to get to know each other, fostering personal and professional relationships between both participants. Most importantly, coaching sessions cultivate a learning environment that adds to each student's education. Establishing a coaching schedule that is practical and effective for both students and can be challenging and demanding. Multiple approaches exist, each holding their own merits and posing unique challenges. When deciding what type of coaching schedule works best for your program, there are a variety of considerations to evaluate before you select the schedule that is right for you. Factors include (a) the size and expertise of your coaching staff, (b) size of your team, and (c) the overarching goals of your program. Each one of these factors will be discussed in greater detail in regard to the four common organizational approaches. The four types of practice schedules include: (a) standardized weekly coaching sessions, (b) variable weekly sessions, (c) standardized team practice times, and (d) what I refer to as "come when you want."

Standardized individual coaching

For individuals who prefer routine, offering standardized coaching may be a good fit. This organizational approach allows coaches to schedule weekly appointments around class schedules, department meetings and other personal and professional obligations. For example, at the beginning of the semester, a coach schedules an hour or half hour set coaching meeting with members of his/her team. These meetings will be the same every week (or every other if you have a large team) for the entire semester. This approach has three advantages.

First, it allows you to micro-manage the events on your team. At almost all times, a coach is aware of the events being run on his or her team and the progress students are making on their individual events. Such meetings allow coaches to interact with team members and monitor the team's progress toward their goals. Second, this approach can foster strong working relationships between coaches and students. These weekly meetings provide an opportunity to learn more about each other. From a social perceptive, a good understanding of their experiences and perceptions are crucial in order to effectively coach a student. Third, this approach provides comfort for coaches and students who thrive under structure. For many, predictability not only provides comfort but is crucial to their success. This approach can be helpful to coaches who may have obligations such as child care or other employment that demands a rigid schedule.

Still, this approach is not without obstacles. The most obvious is the downside of predictability: inflexibility. For coaches whose weekly schedules vary greatly, this coaching approach can prove problematic. Also, some find the standardization of practice can waste time for both students and coaches. If a student has not worked on his/her events since the previous coaching session, both coach and student may experience an uncomfortable feeling of deja vu. Additionally, if you coach a large team and have a small coaching staff (maybe even just you) then it may be difficult to coach every student every week. Finally, this approach does not prioritize events or students, which can be problematic if a student needs more than one hour a week and you cannot offer additional coaching time or you have a poor working relationship with a member of your team.

Variable weekly coaching

When it comes to coaching, flexibility is the cornerstone of this organizational approach. Typically, variable coaching is when you allow students to sign-up for individual coaching sessions weekly. The availability and quantity of the coaching slots varies week-to-week. In general, students schedule these appointments at the teams' weekly meetings. This method also is a smart choice for many reasons. First, it provides the agility that many coaches prefer and demand. For overworked coaches, variable coaching allows you to control and actually manage your hectic agenda. Not only do some coaches favor this method, but many students prefer this approach because their work load varies week to week. Another advantage of this approach is that you allow students to choose their level of commitment to the activity. Coaching is a large part of an educational experience for some students, while others work better with peers or alone. For a team with a large coaching staff, this allows students to coach primarily with the coach they prefer. Finally, this approach allows the coach the option to coach more or less during different points in the season. In other words, you can increase availability during times of high demand such as the beginning of the year and before your state or national tournament.

While this strategy does seem to be the most common coaching approach it also is not without problems. First, students can easily fall under the radar if you

aren't conscious of who is signing up. Also, if your team is large, and your coaching staff is not, then students can become frustrated with the limited availability of coaching that may fit their schedule. This approach can also limit your ability to plan your week in advance. While the coach ultimately has control because they choose when to offer coaching times, he/she may need to offer more time slots then students to assure that students have options for coaching availability. Therefore, you can not be sure what time slots will not be taken and plan your week accordingly.

Standardized team practice

This approach to is akin to high school athletic practice schedules. Here a team has a scheduled time to practice with their coaching staff. For example, a team may meet Monday through Thursday from 4-6 pm, or they meet every Tuesday and Thursday evening to work on their events. While not the most common approach this can be a successful way of establishing a schedule for smaller programs and teams that are linked to an academic course. Some schools allow students to receive practicum hours for their participation on a team and some even require communication majors to compete at least one semester during their collegiate experience. A standardized team practice offers the same benefits as the standardized individual practice and also a transparent practice time for students who are required to participate in forensics. For the student who is participating in forensics to meet a graduation requirement, this style of practicing can prove to be systematic and practical. Perhaps the most glaring benefit of this approach is the ability to incorporate students and faculty in the coaching process. By coaching at the same time, students and coaches can provide feedback to performances, allowing students to learn much by watching their teammates practice.

While this approach can be effective, its limitations are diverse. With regard to efficiency, team practice sessions can limit individual students' progress (unless you have a lot of rooms to run a variety of performances). Additionally, it is challenging to find a specific time where all members of the team and coaching staff are available for team practice.

Come when you want

The last line of attack a coach may choose is what I refer to as "come whenever you want." This approach toward coaching is simply maintaining extended office hours and allow students who are nearby and have extra time to coach to stop by. While this ideal seems crazy to me now, it worked well for me as a graduate student. The students knew when I would be in the office and were welcome to come by and visit or coach. For me, it was a welcome break from my studies and led to both productive and not so productive coaching sessions. For coaches who spend an extended amount of time in the office that is not designated for a particular task, this approach may be appealing. Also, small programs can excel under this format.

Still, common pitfalls can occur. The most common result of this coaching style is numerous students visiting your office. This can be a double edge situation. It is nice for students to have a place on campus to pass the time between classes. However, it can also be difficult to be productive when members of your team are hanging out in your office (if you are lucky enough to have a work space for your team, this challenge evaporates). This approach typically works best for coaches whose daily schedule allows interruption and welcomes a bit of chaos.

A note on peer coaching

Thus far, this discussion has neglected the role peer coaching can play in your teams practice schedule. For many teams, peer coaching is an integral aspect of a student's competitive and educational success. The numbers of approaches to organizing peer coaching are endless. If you have a large team, it is common to assign event captains—students who coach all members of the team who compete in a specific event. Often this is a responsibility taken on by senior or varsity members of the team and is scheduled between the event captain and other team members. Another approach is a scheduled peer coaching time and meeting place for students who want to work with each other. For example, students meet every Wednesday evening to run their events or assist each other in research, writing, or memorizing. Some programs find a less formal approach to peer coaching to be a better fit. Regardless of your approach, peer coaching compliments the work done by your coaching staff and is instrumental to the social dynamics of effective group development.

Length of coaching sessions

You may also be wondering how long your individualized coaching sessions should be. Some coaches prefer thirty minute coaching sessions, others prefer forty five minutes and many enjoy hour long sessions. The thirty minute practice session, allow you to coach more events, but requires that you are efficient in your interaction with the students. The forty-five minute session allows the student to perform more than one event if desired or this span of time can allow the coach and student the opportunity to really deconstruct a specific performance. An hour-long session can provide time for in-depth script editing and delivery polishing.

As you establish a practice schedule for your team, you should play to the strengths of your coaching style, professional demands, and team dynamics. Often finding the best fit for your program is simply trail and error. Plus, what works at the beginning of your coaching career may not be useful later in your career or be effective with different groups of students. Coaching sessions are the foundation of your program; how you choose to manage and organize them can influence your team culture, competitive success and the quality of instruction.

Program BUDGETing: Six Keys to Success

Michael W. Kirch, Cy-Fair College

Abstract

One of the primary challenges of directing a forensics program is successfully planning and administering the program's budget. Forensics directors must increasingly strike a balance between the cost of achieving their students' educational and competitive goals and the needs of their departments and institutions. In addition, while team budgets have continued to decrease, accountability has steadily increased. This has created an environment in which forensics directors are increasingly being asked to do more with less. Unfortunately, many directors come to their jobs with little or no formal budgetary or administrative experience (Workman, 1996). Without this experience, novice directors can fail to effectively utilize allocated funds or to marshal new funds. In some instances, fiscally incompetent directors can even put their programs at risk. This essay uses an easy to remember acronym to advance six keys to successfully planning and administering a forensics budget.

An Arab proverb warns "Money disappears like magic." This is especially true in forensics. Without sound fiscal management and clearly articulated goals, intercollegiate forensics programs can find themselves short on funds and institutional support before they have achieved their desired outcomes. For this reason, of the many duties assigned to program directors, budgeting is perhaps the most important. Although careful financial planning cannot ensure a program's longevity, poor planning and inconsistent budget administration will more than likely hasten its demise. Although programs differ greatly in their financial means and educational desires, there are six keys to successfully planning and administering a program budget: (1) Begin with a program orientation with clearly stated outcomes; (2) Understand the financial procedures of the academic institution; (3) Decide on short- and long-term needs; (4) Get familiar with tournaments types, benefits and costs; (5) Estimate and cultivate all sources of funding and (6) Track expenditures and outcomes.

Before examining these six keys, three caveats are in order. First, although some have discussed the differences between large and small budget teams (e.g., Richardson & Wood, 1993), this essay will focus on general principles of program budgeting. Second, although important, this essay will not address techniques for stretching limited forensic budgets (although see Hanson, 1996; Richardson & Wood, 1993; Worthen, 1995). Finally, as many directors must learn their administrative duties on-the-job, more must be done to train future directors of forensics (see Haga, 1990; Jaswal, 1990; Workman, 1996).

One: Begin with a Program Orientation

The first key to successfully planning and administering a program budget is to begin with a program orientation. According to Bartanan (1994), this "refers

to the competitive and educational philosophies of the program" (p. 41). The orientation should be based upon such issues as financial resources, school size, geographical location, needs of the students, institution and community, and the skills and personal orientation of the director. A meaningful program orientation should also point to clear outcomes that can be measured and assessed. A well-articulated orientation is necessary for several reasons, two of the most important being funding justification and budget allocation.

First, communication educators are continually being asked to justify their competitive forensics programs to administrators (Sellnow & Seekins, 1992). The current shape of many state budgets mandates that directors be able to clearly articulate program goals and to measure desired outcomes. These outcomes may include indicators of student growth and opportunity, department recognition, institutional prestige and/or community outreach. Measurable outcomes serve to justify why programs need and deserve funding. Harris (1989) wisely notes that programs should seek to diversify their rationale for budgetary support and so including multiple measures of success is a very smart strategy (p. 81).

A program's orientation also serves as a guide for allocating resources. Does the orientation call for cultivating a small but well-traveled team or does it call for providing a meaningful experience for as many students as possible? Does the orientation call for taking a large number of students to as many tournaments as possible or for traveling an elite group of students to a smaller number of prestige events? Is it concerned with national exposure and, if so, what national tournament is most in line with programmatic goals? In addition, a program orientation should also answer questions related to student funding obligations. Will students be responsible for any of the costs of forensic travel? Will students be expected to fundraise? What must students do in order to receive travel consideration? In all, a program orientation should provide a roadmap not only for spending sometimes scarce financial resources, but for guiding the program as a whole.

Two: Understand Financial Procedures

The second key is for directors to understand the financial procedures of their academic institution. This is perhaps the most important of the six keys. Although there are many issues to address, answering the following four questions is a good place for directors to begin.

a. Where does the budget come from? The answer to this question is extremely important. If the budget is largely from student fees it can be vulnerable to issues of money spent vs. students served. If the budget is largely from college funds, there may be more impetus to engage in campus activities in order to be seen as integral to student life. The key here is for directors to understand the expectations that the funding agency (or agencies) has for their program. It is important to recognize, however, that directors may need to serve many masters. If so, they need to identify outcomes that will satisfy them all.

b. How is the money allocated? Line item budgets force directors to largely adhere to limits for various expenditures (e.g. $100 for printing, $2000 for hotels, etc.). Block budgets allow funds to drop into various lines without specific prior allocation. Regardless of their budget type, directors should keep category (line) specific records of their expenditures. Directors with line item budgets, however, will need to learn how to accomplish line item transfers in order to best utilize their funding.
c. What are the funds allowed to cover? Some student fee boards do not allow food to be covered by the budget. Some boards do not allow money to be spent on memberships (e.g., for AFA dues). Directors must be aware of what student and program expenses their budget will cover. Directors will also need to ascertain whether or not their own travel and per diem (as well as the travel and per diem of any assistant coaches) is covered by the budget. If not, a separate budget for the expenses of the coaching staff (most likely from the college or department) may be necessary.
d. How are the funds administered? Many colleges now have rather involved systems for procuring travel funds. It is important to know what forms need to be filled out and when they need to be submitted in order to receive funds in a timely manner. Also important for directors is to understand the paperwork that needs to be filled out subsequent to traveling. Directors should also know what needs to be done to pay outside vendors.

Three: Decide on Short- and Long-Term Needs

The third key to success is for directors to decide on short- and long-term budgetary needs. It is easy for directors to get caught up in the present and forget to save for future needs. Short-term needs include money for regular tournament travel including entry fees, lodging, meals, and transportation. Tournament participation and spending patterns should reflect the program orientation. Short-term needs may also include money to cover tournament hosting expenses (lest up-front expenses come out of the director's bank account).

The director should also consider long-term needs. These needs may include such expenses as potential national tournament participation and equipment purchase. Directors given one budget for the year (and not separate regular season and national budgets) should set aside money for end of the year activities and purchases. For this reason, it is also wise for directors to conservatively forecast all sources of fundraising so that they are not caught short as national tournaments approach.

Four: Get Familiar with Tournaments

The fourth key to success is for directors to become intimately familiar with tournament types with their respective costs and benefits. It is very difficult to

plan out suitable experiences for student team members if directors are unfamiliar with the types of tournaments their students can attend. Depending upon geographic location, available tournaments can vary widely, from one-day league tournaments to three-day swing tournaments. They will also differ in entry fees, judge fees, hotel costs, and location. For example, the entry fees for teams competing in league tournaments (such as those hosted by the Valley Forensic League and the Mid-America Forensic League) are covered by a one-time membership fee. This makes attending multiple league tournaments extremely budget-friendly. Two day invitational tournaments, on the other hand, especially those requiring two nights at a hotel, can be very expensive. However, monetary cost should not be the only factor when weighing tournament choice. Other costs can include travel time, time for student event or academic preparation and/or not supporting district tournaments.

In addition to costs, the relative benefits of various tournaments should also be considered. For example, league tournaments, although usually cheaper, are generally two-round affairs and may not adequately prepare a squad for a more rigorous competition experience at nationals. And although difficult tournaments may give a squad competitive seasoning, less difficult tournament can have the benefit of building student self-esteem through the tangible trophy counts. Creating a balanced schedule that aids in achieving program outcomes is an important part of a program's success.

Five: Estimate and Cultivate Funding

The fifth key to success is for directors to estimate and cultivate all sources of funding. As stated above, it is important to conservatively forecast all sources of additional program funding. Regular sources of additional funding include team fundraising, tournament profit, institutional funds (department, division, or college) and student fee emergency funds. The latter two sources will be much easier to receive with a coherent program orientation and well documented outcomes (especially of student achievement as additional funding often goes toward student participation at national tournaments and conventions).

In addition to accurately estimating funding, another important duty of program directors is to cultivate funding. Potential sources vary widely but can include alumni support, scholarships from local service organizations, research awards (some colleges give funds to reward undergraduate research, here in the form of speech preparation), local advertising in tournament booklets, and high school workshops. In addition, directors need to remember that alumni cultivation begins now. They should keep records of tournament participation and stay in touch with all former competitors and students associated with the program. The careful cultivation of an alumni base will assist not only with fundraising and scholarships, but can be imperative if the program is in danger of being cut.

Six: Track Expenditures and Outcomes

The final key to successfully administering a budget is for directors to carefully track all expenditures and outcomes. As important as it is to budget a program, it is even more imperative that the expenditures be documented. A record of current spending is extremely helpful to project future spending. It is also important to track spending so that long-term needs can be projected.

Along with tracking expenditures, it is important to track program outcomes. This record keeping should be done throughout the year. Directors need to be diligent in sending and saving press releases, recording tournament achievements (not just trophies, but signs of student growth) and keeping a record of all department, institution, and community service. A program that can quantitatively and qualitatively demonstrate sounds educational outcomes is a program that is prepared for the financial challenges of higher education funding.

Following the six keys to program BUDGETing discussed will guarantee that basic budgetary needs are addressed. The keys are simple: (1) Begin with a program orientation with clearly stated outcomes; (2) Understand the financial procedures at the institution; (3) Decide on short- and long-term needs; (4) Get familiar with tournaments types, benefits and costs; (5) Estimate and cultivate all sources of funding and (6) Track expenditures and outcomes. Although the keys require reflection and diligence to implement, they will help to ensure that our programs have the opportunity to prosper well into the 21st century.

References

Bartanan, M. D. (1994). Teaching and directing forensics. Scottsdale, AZ: Gorsuch Scarisbrick.

Haga, N. A. (1990). Perspectives of a forensic coach's first year. In *Perspective on Individual Events: Proceedings of the Second Developmental Conference on Individual Events*, L. Schnoor & V. Karns (Eds.). Mankato, MN: Speech Department, Mankato State University.

Hanson, J. (1996, Fall). Reducing financial barriers to participation (online). *Speaker Points.* http://www.phirhopi.org/prp/spkrpts3.2/cont32.html

Harris, E. J. (1989). Strategies to enhance university support for individual events programs. In *Perspective on Individual Events: Proceedings of the First Developmental Conference on Individual Events*, L. Schnoor & V. Karns (Eds.). Mankato, MN: Speech Department, Mankato State University.

Jaswal, A. J. (1990). Helping the inexperienced director. In Perspective on Individual Events: Proceedings of the Second Developmental Conference on Individual Events, L. Schnoor & V. Karns (Eds.). Mankato, MN: Speech Department, Mankato State University.

Richardson, R. R., & Wood, A. (1993, November). Small-budget forensics programs: Problems and solutions. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Miami Beach, FL.

Sellnow, D. D., & Seekins L. L. (1992, October). Justifying forensic programs to administrators: An experiential education opportunity. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Chicago, IL.

Worthen, T. (1995, November). Stretching your forensic budget. Session presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, San Antonio, TX.

Evaluator vs. Critic: Judging Intercollegiate Forensics

Karen Morris, University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire

Abstract

This essay is an examination of the difference between evaluating forensics performances and critiquing them. Definitions for "evaluating" and "critiquing" are provided. The creation of the "evaluator" judge is addressed. In addition, characteristics of the "evaluator" judge are discussed and examples of each of these characteristics are presented. An appeal is made for judges to act as critics and not evaluators.

Each fall, I teach the Communication Theory Course. Each fall, the Rhetorical Criticism Course is also offered and taught by a colleague. And each fall, we have approximately six students who take both courses concurrently and experience such dissonance by this dual participation. I decided to remedy the situation this year by discussing this problem with my colleague. I wanted to find out exactly what he was teaching in his course; how the students could confuse content from both courses; and how the students managed to transpose the final projects for both courses. From my conversation with my colleague 1 was finally enlightened. Very simply put, the students are taught in the Communication Theory Course how to evaluate and the students are taught in the Rhetorical Criticism Course how to critique. The problem arises when we teach the students for most of their college experience to *evaluate* (to give their opinion, to measure the value of an item) and then in their last year we ask them to *critique* only (to apply a formula and decide if something is or is not, but not if something is good or bad). This concept of *evaluation vs. criticism* was why so many of our crossover students were having such difficulty taking both the Theory and Criticism Classes concurrently

As I am prone to do, I thought about the application of this problem to the field of Collegiate Forensics. It would appear that the very nature of this activity lends itself toward evaluation. Don't we measure the value of students' performances and isn't this evaluation presented in the form of a ballot? We assume that this measurement is based on some sort of standard and not just our opinion. However, there are quite a few occasions in which the ballots that our students receive are based purely on opinion. And so the question becomes apparent, "Are judges supposed to be evaluating students or critiquing them?" Keep in mind the definitions of both evaluation and criticism established previously. I would contend that many times as judges we evaluate performances instead of critiquing them. I would also contend that the judges who are most guilty of this confusion are those who have just recently completed their years of competition. As coaches, we have taught our students to evaluate their own performances, to make statements, to stand up for what they believe; and we do this for all of the years that they are competitors. Then they either graduate or run out of eligibility and we have them judge for us. These "experienced competitors-first time

judges" evaluate performances instead of critiquing them. As directors, we have created a monster and it's called the fifth year student judge or the first year graduate student. Please understand that not all students who judge for the first time are "evaluator judges" and not every "experience" judge is necessarily a "critic judge. To better understand this concept of an "evaluator" judge vs. a critic, I will define an evaluator judge and then give several characteristics of this type of judge in hopes that we can all become a little more effective in our critiquing.

Defining an Evaluator

Obviously the very nature of forensics is subjective. As judges we make decisions about who should receive which rank in the round. However the justification for this decision is the distinction between an evaluator and a critic. The judge that is new to this activity (the lay judge) is sometimes the fairest judge because they measure the performances based on the standards put forth in the event rules. Absent are the hidden agendas and most often the politics of the activity. "Unwritten rules" are not applied because the inexperienced judge is unaware of these rules and will not use them as the standard. The type of judge that will fall into the evaluating category is the judge who has some type of vested interest in the activity. Either they have a "name" to defend; a point to make; a lesson to teach or something very personable to say. The unfortunate fact is that many of the evaluators do not realize that they have become this type of judge. I urge us to look at some of the characteristics of this type of judge and continually check to make sure that we remain critics and not evaluators.

Characteristics of an Evaluator

Although there are many different types of evaluators in forensics (differing ages and experience) the mindset of the evaluator is basically the same. The evaluator puts themselves first! Although the students performing in the round should be the focus of the event, the evaluator's mindset belies the attitude that their ballot is key. This mindset of putting self first manifests itself in the actual writing of the ballot. By reading the evaluator's ballot, it is evident what type of judge has ranked this round. The comments written by the evaluator usually fall into the following three categories:

Here's how this event should be done

The judge who evaluates the performance will usually let the performer know not only what they are doing wrong but what they *should* be doing. This evaluation is based on the judge's opinion. Comments pertaining to "unwritten" rules or regional preferences belie this attitude. Usually the evaluator *informs* the performer (and the performer's coach) of the "rules" of the event. If these "rules" were indeed a part of the event description then the evaluator would be critiquing, but since these preferences are presented by the judge as rules, then the judge

becomes an evaluator presenting their own opinion. In addition, the evaluator will present these preferences as "reasons for rank" and often penalize the student for not having a teaser or not using problem/cause/solution format or not using a 2 by 2 format, etc. It is when the evaluator presents their personal preference as fact that the judge is no longer a critic.

Hey Buddy!

Another type of comment that you will find on an evaluator's ballot is the familiarizing comment. The judge that comments on personal relationships via the ballot has fallen into the category of the evaluator. No longer is the ballot an objective measure of the student's performance but mention of the relationship has brought to light facts that have no place in the ranking process. Remember that the true evaluator's mindset is one in which they put themselves (or their relationships) first. With this mindset the familiarizing comment usually includes statements such as "Hey (insert nickname here)" "You should know better" "Tell so and so hi" "I liked your piece from last year better" "What were you thinking?" "Why are you doing this crap?" etc. Such personal comments are obviously opinion and categorize the judge as an evaluator and not a critic.

I *know the history of forensics*

Most would agree that the round should be judged according to the pieces actually in the round. Which piece in the round was performed 2 years ago or 10 years ago matters very little to most judges. However, the evaluator has a vested interest in letting the participant know that they are a judge who knows their forensics history. The evaluator judge will write comments on the ballot such as "My teammate did this last year" "This piece was in a national out round last year" "One of my students is doing this piece this year" or "I did this piece before." The evaluator feels the need to inform the participant about the performance history of that piece. The assumption here is that the performer does not know the history of the piece and if he/she did then they would certainly change it. The assumption is also that other judges make decisions based on the performance history. Either way, the evaluator's choice to voice their opinion of the piece being "overdone" keeps them from becoming a critic.

I realize that at some point all judges are guilty of being evaluators, but my hope is that we can remember to critic the performance from a more objective point of view. If the mindset of the judge is to put the performer first then the mindset is more in line of that of a critic. It is when the judge feels the need to make a statement or call attention to their credentials that they become an evaluator. Just as my students have difficulty switching from the evaluative mindset in the Communication Theory course to the critical mindset of the Rhetorical Criticism Course, so do our forensics competitors when they coach for the first time. As Directors of Forensics, coaches and judges this is a pitfall we should watch out for ourselves and caution those we are mentoring to avoid. Forensics

is, of course, a subjective activity. But that subjectivity does not have to include the personal agenda of the judge. When the focus is on the performer and not on the judge, only then can we call ourselves critics.

Identifying and Evaluating the "Unwritten Rules" of Competition

Richard E. Paine, North Central College

Abstract

At first glance, forensics appears to be regulated only in broad terms by formal sets of rules. However, participants quickly discover that the written guidelines are supplemented by a plethora of "unwritten rules" which can be difficult to learn. In exploring these rules, we will address six questions. First, do unwritten rules exist? The answer is a definite "yes." Second, why do these rules exist? Regulating both event-specific norms and general tournament behaviors, these guidelines provide a sense of objective stability in what is in fact a subjective arena. Third, how can newcomers learn the rules? A series of potentially helpful steps are suggested. Fourth, what are some of the educational advantages and/or disadvantages of these rules? Both the benefits and the drawbacks of following these rules are considered. Fifth, do students and coaches like these rules? While those who remain in the activity tend to grow fond of them, their operation encourages others to walk away. Finally, should people fight the rules or play within them? Several arguments are examined, and the importance of being open to risk-taking is highlighted.

For students, coaches, judges and programs who decide to dive into the competitive world of forensics, the waters can look deceptively smooth and open. A wide array of events offer the chance to express diverse interests and develop varied talents while the absence of extensive written rules establishes a broad playing area in which individuals can make far-ranging choices. However, as participants immerse themselves in the game, they discover that a complex set of unwritten rules creates undertows and cross-currents that impact significantly on the way in which the activity plays out. Very quickly, those new to intercollegiate forensics discover that these unwritten rules possess tremendous power, functioning to separate the "in-group" who know and follow the rules from the "out-group" who do not have access to (or deliberately choose to flout) these assumptive guidelines. The goal of this essay is to demystify the nature of these unwritten rules by asking and responding to six key questions which can be asked about them. It is my hope that this process will serve the dual purpose of making the activity more accessible to newcomers and more valuable to those already well acquainted with the game.

1. Do unwritten rules in fact exist?

Technically, the words "rules" and "norms" refer to distinctively different constructs. Rules are often formal and explicit whereas norms tend to be informal and implicit. Rules may be enacted at a particular moment by an official governing body, while norms are habits or patterns which evolve over time among the

members of a community. Rules are relatively more "hard and fast" or invariant in their enforcement, while norms tend to be more flexible in their application. In the context of forensics, the rules which govern the activity are comparatively few - but the norms which operate on the competitive circuit are legion. In the present article, when we talk about the "unwritten rules" we are in fact talking about "norms." Thus, while the words "rules" and "norms" will be used interchangeably in the following discussion, it is helpful to remember that what we're really talking about are habits and patterns which may become so entrenched that that operate as if they were "rules" - when in fact they are generally accepted conventions that we as members of the community are potentially able to modify in major and minor ways whenever we wish to (perhaps through individual action, and assuredly through our collective will).

So do such unwritten rules (or norms) in fact exist? As this question relates to guidelines which shape the presentation and judging of competitive programs, the answer is an obvious "yes." Andy Billings (2002) notes that "the first day that one of my students joins the team, they receive a forty-page booklet that explains the events. They are told to treat it as their forensic Bible. The booklet does not merely tell the students what the events are; it also tells students the hidden secrets for success. In essence, they are formulas" (p. 32). Such "formulas" provide coherently packaged explanations of the "unwritten rules." Gaer (2002) similarly affirms the existence of such rules, arguing that forensics is an activity dominated by "conventions" or "unwritten formulas established by coaches, judges and students" which constitute "ways of winning" (p. 54). Over the years, many articles have been devoted to the description and analysis of such event-specific norms (Ballinger & Brand, 1987; Crawford, 1984; Cummings, 1995; Harris, 1986; Harris, 1987; Hefling, 1990; Reynolds, 1983; Sellnow & Ziegelmueller, 1988; White & Messer, 2003 and many others) while innumerable convention programs have explored the "do's" and "don'ts" associated with each event in the forensics pantheon. These guidelines are living organisms which evolve over the years, yet (as is true of all cultural components) this evolution is a very gradual process which leaves many of the unwritten rules virtually unmodified for long periods of time.

However, the unwritten rules regulate much more than simply the performance guidelines associated with particular events. They reach out to influence virtually every aspect of the forensics experience. For example, typical restrictions on the clothing choices made by students may include such directives as: (1) the ideal colors for women to wear are black and white (and perhaps red), while men should select dark 'business colors' like charcoal, navy blue, olive, and black, (2) men should always wear shirts and ties along with suit coats, while women are best served by business suits (pants, seldom considered ideal, may or may not be acceptable), (3) nobody should wear big clunky jewelry that draws the eye to it in a distracting way, and (4) informal articles of clothing like jeans and t-shirts are absolutely forbidden. Other unwritten rules regulate the way we react to the posting of finalists ("never scream or show unduly intense excitement or disappointment"), the nonverbal behaviors evident during award assemblies ("clap

equally for everybody and never cheer for your own school or give the raspberry to another school"), the way we enter rooms ("wait quietly outside the door if the round is already in progress and only walk in when you're absolutely sure nobody is speaking"), the way we leave rooms ("ask the judge's permission to leave if you depart mid-round to get to another event, but don't wave and shout 'good luck' to the other contestants"), and even the way students write their names on the blackboard ("print your name rather than use cursive letters, and don't make your handwriting either too big or too small"). Unlocking the code of such unwritten conventions can be a mystifying challenge for those new to the activity. It's not just a question of what the rules are, but also a question of why such rules exist at all. The bottom line is quite simple: the vast majority of an individual's behavior at a tournament is subject to reward or censure under the operation of the unwritten rules of the activity.

2. Why do these rules exist?

The forensics community constitutes an identifiable subculture. And inevitably, cultures and subcultures create group codes to live by. Dodd (1998) explains that "culture is the holistic interrelationship of a group's identity, beliefs, values, activities, rules, customs, communication patterns, and institutions...it shapes thinking, acting, and communicating according to group expectations" (p. 36). The unwritten rules provide the members of a subculture with a sense of clarity. They render the group experience comprehensible and allow members to "make sense" of their shared world. These rules are especially important when members confront situations involving conflict. And of course, by its very nature, forensics is a continuous string of conflicts: one round of competition follows another in an endless stream. In each round, judges must employ some set of criteria to enable them to rank and rate the contestants they watch. Meanwhile, the contestants must try to understand why they win or lose to their competitors. By its very nature, forensics demands that judges make largely "subjective" decisions - the very performance that one judge loves will be severely criticized by another critic. The frequent lack of inter-judge consistency can be very frustrating for competitors. Thus, the more these decisions appear to abide by a mutually accepted body of rules or norms, the easier it is to make and accept the decisions that are made. Judges and competitors are encouraged to stay in the arena and "keep fighting" if they can "figure out the game" - but if the world of competition appears to be unfocussed, random, and beyond the control of those participating, then it becomes more likely that people will walk away from the activity in disgust. As a result, ever since there have been tournaments, there has been pressure to standardize as many of the practices associated with them as possible. It's not that any given practice is "the only way to go." After all, other practices could theoretically have been adopted which would have worked just as well or better. But in the choice between chaos and clarity, the unspoken rules provide functional directions.

The application of these rules is not limited to the regulation of obviously important issues - they can operate in relation to even the most trivial of topics.

For example, in the Midwest the norm is for competitors signing into rounds to write both their first and last names on the board. In other regions, the norm is for students to write only their last names on the blackboard. Either way "works." Judges in both areas are able to look at the blackboard and acquire the basic information they need to fill out the ballot. Yet, there are clearly different regional expectations in play here. And while it embarrasses me a little to say it, I must admit that, as a judge from the Midwest, it doesn't feel "right" to me when a student doesn't put her or his first name on the board (does she/he have something to hide?).

Other unwritten rules give shape to issues that are of more obvious weight. For example, students are expected to be "good audiences" for the other competitors performing in their rounds. If a judge looks over at student "A" while student "B" is performing and notices that "A" is memorizing his own speech, painting her nails, staring out the window, or even taking a nap, then it's highly likely that the rank/rating received by student "A" will somehow reflect a penalty imposed by the judge. There is no "written rule" to force students to politely pay attention to each other, but the operation of unwritten norms helps to ensure that student performers are minimally likely to be “thrown off” by deliberately rude or callously indifferent auditors.

Clearly, as they relate to either major points of etiquette or minor points of habit, the "unwritten rules" narrow the acceptable options available to us as we operate within the naturally ambiguous tournament context. Unsure of "what we should do" in any given situation, the assumptive communal subtext lights our path. By accepting "one way" as "the way," the world of forensics becomes comprehensible and graspable, order is brought out of chaos, and the ground solidifies under our feet.

3. How can newcomers learn the rules?

Some rules seem to apply virtually nationwide, while others are region or area specific. Programs or competitors wishing to become involved in the activity may consider taking the following steps.

First, talk to people who are currently involved in the community or have been involved in recent years. Competitors, coaches, and judges from other schools and/or from one's own school are invaluable sources of information.

Second, don't talk to just one or two people - try to talk to several. Because the "unwritten rules" are "unwritten," they may be perceived quite differently by different people. Some members of the community may be very aware of "rules" relative to certain topics yet relatively unaware of the unspoken guidelines which operate relative to other aspects of the activity. One person may see rule "A" as absolute ("every oral interpretation performance should have a teaser"), while another person perceives that same rule as minor and/or easily sidestepped ("I don't care if students provide teasers or not"). One person may argue that there is only "one way" to do a certain thing ("every Persuasion should follow the problem-solution format"), while another person will assert that several options are

possible. Thus, the more people one talks to, the more well-rounded a picture one is likely to get of the actual situation. Remember that the vast majority of people involved in the activity truly want to help other programs grow and thrive. As more and more healthy programs flourish across the country, the quality of the experience for everyone is improved.

Third, consider attending a tournament or two simply as "an observer" rather than as a competitor. Try to keep your eyes open to as many aspects of the activity as possible inside and outside of the actual rounds of competition. Compare notes with other people from your school who attend the tournament. During or after the tournament, ask questions of each other and of "tournament insiders" who may be able to answer any questions or react to (interpret and help to make sense of) your observations.

Fourth, read scholarly articles on the activity which have been published in places like The National Forensic Journal. These offer invaluable insights into the operation of the community and the "unwritten expectations" that surround the performance of particular events, the dictates of "tournament etiquette," and so on.

Fifth, make conscious choices about what the goals and guidelines for your own program should be. Every program nationwide participates to some degree in the general ethos of the circuit, but each also builds its own tradition of practices, guidelines, expectations, and hopes. No program should feel that it "has to do" anything a certain way just because that way constitutes the circuit norm. Each program director has the right and the responsibility to develop a program which best fits the needs of her/his own self, students, and school.

4. What are some of the educational advantages and/or disadvantages of these rules?

Many of the unwritten rules can help students to learn very valuable lessons and/or skills. For example, while no written rules exist to specify how Impromptu speeches should be organized, the unwritten rules call on competitors to develop clearly partitioned main points (usually 2 or 3 of them) which work together to demonstrate a central thesis clearly identified near the beginning of the speech. This basic organizational structure is generally useful to students who can employ it not only in this one speaking event but in a variety of contexts (writing papers for classes, responding to essay exams, delivering other public speeches, and so on). Very few of the unwritten rules are purely capricious - essentially all of them develop a worthwhile skill, advocate proper social etiquette, or exemplify tried-and-true methods of "effective" speaking. Thus, learning the rules can promote the acquisition of an array of educational goals.

Unfortunately, the rules can also inhibit creative experimentation and potentially ground-breaking risk-taking. Once students learn that a certain formula is what "wins," many become unwilling to push the envelope which surrounds the straight-and-narrow path. After all, why take a chance on something new that may not work when the old well-worn road to success is so clearly visible? The general wisdom seems to be that students are expected to serve a period of

"apprenticeship" at the start of their competitive careers, demonstrating that they know and are able and willing to follow the standardized rules. Then, after they have sufficiently "proven themselves" (perhaps around their third year of competition), they are free to venture off the beaten path and take some chances. In fact, they may be rewarded for these risks (provided that the risks are not too extreme and violate some rules but not others). For example, not long ago 1 coached a student who during her first two years of competition built a strong reputation on the circuit. During her junior year she decided to change the color of her wardrobe, and instead of wearing exclusively black clothes to tournaments she purchased a vivid lime-green suit. Many ballots complimented her on this "bold choice," and virtually no ballot ever chastised her for breaking the applicable unwritten rules. For her, earning the opportunity to bend the rules was a truly liberating experience. Last year, another of my students tossed aside almost all of the conventional structural norms regulating Persuasion and developed his speech around a Native American organizational format that most of his judges had never heard of before. Some judges embraced this innovation and rewarded him with high scores. Others could not accept this violation of the norms and "tanked" him. For this student, the joy of risk-taking and the value of learning-from-experimentation far outweighed his interest in trophies. His commitment to the idea of the speech took precedence over the demand of some judges for conformity, and he was happy to live with the consequences of his choice. Meanwhile, students who do not (or cannot) find personally satisfying ways to bend the rules may become tired of the activity. Playing the same game by the same rules and producing the same basic product year after year can become boring, and over the years I have seen many students withdraw from the activity because they felt that forensics had "nothing left to teach them." The truth is that every performance in every round offers opportunities for more growth. However, that growth is only possible if one is willing to break the unwritten rules, challenge the conventions, and run the risk of "losing the ballot" (a daunting possibility for the experienced competitor or coach who is used to winning and whose ego has become deeply invested in the outcome of the game).

5. Do students and coaches like these rules?

The answer to this question varies from person to person. Overall, the students who remain in the activity tend to develop an attachment to the unwritten rules. In fact, when asked what aspects of the activity most make it "fun" or enhance their level of personal commitment to it, one of the prime factors identified by students is the level of "professionalism" (willingness to play according to the unwritten rules) which typifies their teammates, their coaches, and their own experience (Paine & Stanley, 2000). The rules seem to provide a security net, a blueprint to the forensics world which makes it more pleasurable to travel through. On the other hand, those students who enjoy taking risks and acting individualistically seem to be more likely to drop off the team. This pattern clearly has practical implications for coaches as they shape the ethos of their own team.

Will they train students to be winners who play by the rules, or will they encourage them to be experimental individualists who do not make "winning" their ultimate goal? Of course, some risk-takers will win and some students who adhere to the known patterns will not - but the general patterns are not obviated by the exceptions.

Coaches also view the unwritten rules in different ways. Overall, it seems that "new coaches" who have recently completed their own competitive careers tend to place more faith in the value of the unwritten rules. But as the years go by, many coaches seem to become less attached to the redundant patterns of standardization and grow more open to experimental choices. Of course, the relationship between length of career and attachment to standardization is not invariant. For example, perhaps one of the most risk-rewarding judges on the circuit last year was a graduate student who had been a competitor just the year before. Thus, in pragmatic terms, it is helpful for any given competitor to know as much as possible before the round starts about the tastes of the critic sitting in the back of the room. It can be helpful to remember that no performance is "frozen" from round to round - practicing appropriate audience analysis, the same speech or literary selection can be performed in very different ways in two successive rounds depending on who is evaluating it. Talk to the judges. Read the ballots they have written. As a competitor, allow yourself to make different performance choices round-by-round as the circumstances warrant.

6. Should I fight the rules, or play within them?

This question must be answered on four interlocking levels. First, as individual coaches and competitors, we must select for ourselves our own personal goals (and those of the programs we represent). What is it that we feel we "need" to get out of our forensics experience? Ideally, I believe that it is desirable to start by learning the rules. After all, the conventions exist for a reason. Understanding them and following them (at least at times, at least when the circumstances make it desirable) can help us to teach and learn valuable educational lessons. While following the unwritten rules can support competitive success (in and of itself a potentially desirable goal), it can also help students to learn important lessons about such diverse topics as structure, pacing, cutting, research, etiquette, and so on. Yet blindly following the norms forever can be experientially and educationally stultifying. Which rules we follow, and how long we follow them, must be a function of our goals: what do we need/want to learn and/or accomplish, and what do we have to do in order to reach those ends?

To help us answer this question for ourselves, we need to keep in mind a second key issue: the difference between "meaningful" and "meaningless" norm challenges. For example, in recent years the prototypical Informative speech has examined a medical and/or technological topic. Challenging this norm allows students (both as speakers and as audience members) to learn a lot of important information drawn from other fields of knowledge. Confronting this topic-choice norm has the potential to be a "meaningful" challenge. But are some challenges

in fact relatively "meaningless?" The circuit expects competitors to use black binders in oral interpretation. Would a student learn anything worthwhile from using a bright orange binder just to "stand out" or "be different?" Here, opinions may differ. Some might say that there doesn't seem to be any viable or educationally significant reason behind such a challenge: changing the binder's color might draw attention, but it's unlikely to help the student give a better performance. Others, however, would argue that every norm potentially deserves to be challenged. For example, a student interpreting a piece of prose meta-fiction might argue that an orange binder would reflect the tone/nature of the text more appropriately than would a sedate black folder. Pushed to the extreme, such risk-takers might assert that the real question is not "why should I break a norm?" but rather "why shouldn't I push the envelope?" On balance, I would argue that every choice should be a deliberate one: whatever we choose to do, we should know why we're doing it, and we should be able to explain to others the basis for our choice if asked to do so (especially since answering this question can help others to learn and grow from our decision to experiment).

As we decide what norms to honor vs. challenge, and as we decide how strictly to hold both ourselves and others to the unwritten rules, we need to keep in mind a third key point: the limits of the unwritten rules. They can choke off creativity. They can kill the joy that comes with the free-fall of experimentation. This is true not only for students, but also for coaches and judges. As argued by Gaer (2002), "we as a community and especially as judges and coaches need to...get out of the rut we have created...[and] stop attempting to simplify the coaching and judging process by adding formulaic rules to a creative and expressive activity. Think of the judging process as a means by which we would suggest ways for each student individually to enhance or improve their performance, not to 'fit in' with the rest of the crowd" (p. 55). After all, as Gaer goes on to avow, "there is not a coach/judge among us who would argue that this activity could be even more educational if we only take the time to develop an open mind when it comes to the events we coach/judge" (p. 56). In a similar vein, Burnett (2002) asserts that "the success formulas...stifle creativity and certainly do not provide new material for forensic research. Not only are these formulas troubling, they are time-consuming for the coach who must take excessive amounts of time to suggest obscure pieces for oral interpretation or obscure topics for public address. In addition, working through the formulaic, stifling 'unwritten rules' takes time away from other academic duties" (p. 80).

This raises a fourth key issue: the difficulties and opportunities faced by coaches vs. competitors vs. judges when it comes to challenging the unwritten rules. Judges can only evaluate the performances they see. Thus, unless coaches and students are willing to courageously duel the norms, judges will have no choice but to continue rewarding "the same old thing." It's also a numbers game. If only one student at a tournament chooses to buck the system, then it's very easy for judges to "down" that one competitor. But if two students, or ten, or the majority of the students in any given event decide to push the envelope, then the pressure reverses itself and judges may be more likely to seriously consider the

value of risk-taking. Of course, much of the power for change lies in the hands of the judges. Judges who strictly enforce the unwritten rules add weight to the status quo and act as barriers to creative experimentation. Is that good? Is it bad? It all depends. To return to a theme we have already stressed, as coaches, competitors and judges, it's important that we consciously review our behavior patterns. What do we really want the activity to teach? What is it most important that we walk away from a tournament having learned? Some norms promote important lessons, some reflect arbitrary preferences, and some perpetuate counterproductive patterns. Rather than sleepwalking through our accustomed paces, we all need to consciously reflect on what we're doing and be sure that we can justify our choices to ourselves, our students, our peers, our administrators, our schools, and our society. Ultimately, even those students who find security in the safety net of conventions need to be brave enough to jump from the nest if they want to keep learning. Even those judges who most love the rules must be willing to reward students who dare to soar beyond them.

References

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

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

Burnett, A. (2002). Ain't no cure for the coaching blues. *National Forensic Journal, 20,* 79-81.

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

Cummings, M. (1995). Making forensics accessible for the novice: comments and resolutions from panel two. *Constructing the Deconstruction: Re-formulating Forensics for the New Century. Proceedings from the Pi Kappa Delta Developmental Conference.* Shreveport, Louisiana.

Dodd, C. (1998). *Dynamics of lntercultural Communication.* 5th. ed. Dubuque, Iowa: Brown & Benchmark.

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

Harris, E.J., Jr. (1986). Judge demographics and criteria for extemp and impromptu at N.F.A. Nationals. *National Forensic Journal, 4,* 135-147.

Harris, E.J., Jr. (1987). Rhetorical criticism: Judges' expectations and contest standards. *National Forensic Journal, 5,* 21-25.

Hefling, J.L. (1990). What I think you should do is.... Perspectives on Individual Events: Proceedings of the Second Developmental Conference on Individual Events. Denver, Colorado.

Paine, R., & Stanley, J. (2000). Nourishing the plant: Developing team loyalty and commitment in the field of forensics. A paper presented to the National Communication Association, Seattle.

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

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

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

The Coach as Mentor

Leah White, Minnesota State University-Mankato

Abstract

The purpose of this essay is to discuss the role of the forensic coach as a mentor. A significant amount of a coach's time is spent encouraging students to succeed not just in forensics, but in their academic, interpersonal and professional lives as well. Bennetts (2002) suggests there are four common approaches to mentoring; cloning, nurturing, friendship and apprenticeship. I explain these models as well as discuss the advantages and disadvantages of each as they relate to coaching forensics. The essay concludes with an overview of practical steps one can take to develop mentoring relationships with one's students. If managed well, mentoring relationships can be one of the most rewarding aspects of coaching forensics.

As forensic educators we expect to spend countless hours helping students polish their speaking and performance skills. What often takes new coaches off guard, however, is the significant amount of time one spends functioning as a "life coach." Due to the sheer amount of time we spend with our students in coaching sessions, meetings and weekend travel, it makes sense that students will gravitate toward us when they need guidance and advice in other areas of their lives. Many a scheduled coaching session can quickly develop into an hour-long discussion of the student's academic anxieties, relational conflicts, fears about the future, or numerous other personal concerns. Out of these discussions evolve forensic coaches as fundamental mentors.

Bennetts (2002) defines traditional mentor relationships as "intimate learning alliances that happen naturally" (p. 155). Buell (2004) adds a parental element to the definition of a mentor stating that a mentor is "a person who looks after, advises, protects, and takes a special interest in another's development" (p. 58). When a mentoring relationship develops between a coach and his/her student, a special connection is established beyond the shared goals for competitive success. The coach as mentor seeks to guide the student to success in all aspects of life. Although taking on a mentoring role with one's students is a significant time commitment, it can provide substantial benefits to both parties. Bennetts claims mentoring relationships can be "mutually transforming" for both mentor and mentee, as each moves toward increased self-actualization, (p. 163). Personally, my role as a mentor to students provides the most overall fulfillment as a coach. As enjoyable as it is to see them win a competition, I am far more satisfied when I watch them graduate and head off to rewarding careers and relationships.

To function as an effective mentor, a coach must identify a mentoring style. My goal in this short essay is to present several models of mentoring, briefly discuss the advantages and disadvantages of each, and finally offer some practical suggestions for how to nurture a mentoring relationship regardless of the model to which one adheres.

Buell (2004) presents four common models of mentoring: cloning, nurturing, friendship and apprenticeship. According to Buell's research, the cloning model, where a mentor attempts to "produce a duplicate copy of him or herself from a top-down position," has lost favor in the academic community (p. 64). Although a generation ago this model was popular, most current educators see it as a negative approach and prefer one of the other three. I will therefore focus my attention on the nurturing, friendship and apprenticeship models.

According to Buell (2004), the nurturing model "represents a mentoring style in which a mentor fulfills some of the functions of a parent figure, creating a safe, open environment in which a mentee can both learn and try things for him- or herself (p. 65). This approach to mentoring is characterized by empathetic guidance. The mentor shows a genuine concern for the mentee, but still maintains a stance as the more knowledgeable in the partnership. The mentor's role is not to control the mentee, but rather to guide the mentee toward making wise life choices.

The advantage to this mentoring approach is that a mentor may establish trust in the relationship without risking a loss of respect from the mentee. Some level of hierarchy in the relationship can be beneficial. A coach is the leader of the team and frequently will make unpopular decisions. Maintaining an element of professional distance between yourself and students will preserve your authority, yet the care you show as a nurturing mentor helps students accept and trust your decisions. A key disadvantage to the nurturing model of mentoring is dependency. According to McAuley (2003) mentoring relationships often tap into "narcissistic aspects of self (p. 19). Students may become overly dependent on the guidance of their coach, and in turn, coaches may have trouble letting go of students when their direction is no longer necessary (Buell, 2004). Students need to learn to be independent thinkers, and coaches need to be able to recognize when a student has outgrown the mentoring relationship. Essentially, sometimes you just have to "cut the cord" so as to avoid an overly dependent and possibly self-serving relationship.

Like the nurturing model of mentoring, the friendship model is characterized by trust and care, but it is more "collaborative and co-constructed" (Buell, 2004, p. 67). The friendship approach to mentoring views mentor and mentee as peers who are equals. There is no hierarchical distance between the involved parties. Mentor and mentee view each other as close friends without the presence of any professional distance. This model is characterized by a complementary and reciprocal relationship.

Those who adhere to this model of mentoring claim the main advantage is intense trust established through a high level of intimacy. For many, this provides a more mutually fulfilling relationship. Kalbfleisch (2002) cautions that a key drawback to mentoring is loss of time for the mentor. The reciprocal nature of the friendship approach to mentoring means that the mentor is also seeking advice and guidance from the mentee. As such, the mentoring relationship is not as draining for the mentor. As a forensic coach, however, this approach to mentoring could have significant disadvantages. The loss of authority one may experi-

ence by eliminating any sense of professional hierarchy could make it difficult for a coach to maintain control over his/her team. Chaos could erupt if students feel that all decisions are open for mutual negotiation. Another disadvantage of the friendship approach to mentoring is that it may place the coach at risk for accusations of unprofessional behavior. Regardless of the level of friendship that develops between a coach and student, an organizational hierarchy of faculty-student still exists. When boundaries surrounding topics of conversation and social interactions dissolve due to the heightened level of intimacy that grows in a friendship, a coach places him/herself at risk for claims of harassment. An eighteen year old does not always interpret relationships in the way a coach intended.

Buell's (2004) research revealed an additional mentoring model that seemed to be a combination of the cloning, nurturing and friendship models. Known as the apprenticeship model, this approach to mentoring is characterized by a short-term relationship where the mentor assists in the mentee's learning process. This model is "a pragmatic, largely 'hands-off' model that involves mentoring without moving into the more personal or social aspects" evident in the nurturing and friendship models (Buell, 2004, p. 71). In the apprenticeship model of mentoring the professional relationship between mentor and mentee is key. Young et. al. (2004) argue that collegiality is crucial to a successful mentoring relationship. The apprenticeship model of mentoring lends itself to the development of collegial relationships.

An advantage of the apprenticeship model of mentoring is that it helps one avoid some of the professional and emotional risks associated with the nurturing and friendship approaches. By focusing one's mentoring efforts on the development of a student's communication and performance skills only, a coach is able to maintain some boundaries. These professional boundaries may protect the coach from exhausting him/herself emotionally, as well as lessen the risk for accusations of unprofessional behavior. Additionally, taking an apprenticeship approach to mentoring allows a coach to mentor all students equally. The expectations of the nurturing and friendship approaches to mentoring make it extremely difficult for a coach to mentor each student on a team. A disadvantage of this style of mentoring, however, is that the relationships that develop will most likely not be as interpersonally rewarding. What one gains in professional distance, one loses in interpersonal intimacy.

My intent in reviewing these mentoring models is not to suggest that a coach must select one style of mentoring and proceed accordingly. Rather, I believe an effective forensic coach should utilize the nurturing, friendship and apprenticeship models at various points during his/her career. A young coach, such as a Graduate Assistant, who may be only slightly older, the same age or even younger than students may need to err on the side of maintaining a level of professional distance. Yet, the closeness of age makes these coaches uniquely suited to the advantages of the friendship model. An element of cohesion often exists between students and younger coaches that an older coach cannot fully access. Young coaches should be cautioned, however, to be wary of how close friendships with students could harm their ability to maintain an authoritative stance.

The approach to mentoring one uses should fundamentally depend on the student involved. For example, I am cautious about developing a friendship style of mentoring with undergraduates, but I often see my mentoring relationships with graduate student coaches evolve into friendships. These students naturally develop into peers and are usually mature enough to understand the awkward issues of hierarchy involved in this style of mentoring. On a more cynical note, sometimes you simply do not get along with a student. In such cases, the professional distance of the apprenticeship model of mentoring will allow you to provide the student with guidance, but spare you the emotional energy of having to navigate a more personal relationship.

In some cases, your mentoring approach will change as a student matures. Frequently the annoying student you mentored using the apprenticeship approach when she was a freshman, matures into a delightful adult by her senior year and your mentoring relationship has become one more aligned with the friendship model. Similarly, an insecure freshman may require the nurturing approach early on in his forensic career, but by the time he is a junior he is confident and needs less emotional guidance from you.

Regardless of the model one chooses to follow, there are several practical steps a coach can take to foster mentoring relationships. The most important action is to simply provide adequate time for one-on-one discussions to occur. Ideally, coaching appointments should focus on skill development. There are, however, other coaching opportunities when mentoring can happen. I usually try to hold goal-setting appointments at the start of each semester. If I am most comfortable taking the apprenticeship approach toward mentoring a student, I keep these meetings focused on competitive goals and skill improvement. If I am drawn toward the nurturing style of mentoring with a particular student, I use these special meetings to ask the student more specific questions about his/her academics, family and future plans. When traveling, I try to fluctuate with whom I sit during team meals. This allows me to interact with several different students over the weekend. I am able to steer mealtime conversation toward topics appropriate to the type of mentoring I wish to do. I often do the same thing with whom I encourage to sit "shotgun" when I am driving. Many a career path has been planned or roommate conflict resolved during a long Interstate drive after midnight.

Some of my most cherished possessions are the hand written notes given to me by key mentors in my life. I make it a habit to give every student a card the night before the national tournament. I spend a significant amount of time writing the messages in these cards. In addition to the usual encouraging words, I also use these cards as a way to try to bring closure to some of the issues the student and I have discussed in our mentoring conversations throughout the year. For some students this means praising them for accomplishing a difficult performance skill, for others it is pointing out a growth in personal esteem or emotional maturity. The content of the notes is guided by the mentoring style I have used with the student throughout the year.

Mentoring is an important aspect of a forensic coach's job. Although it is not what we are "officially" hired to do, it is fundamental to the success of our

programs. A coach who serves as a positive mentor for his/her students will help teach those same students to perform a similar role for others. As Gabbard (2004) states in his reflections on the importance of mentoring, "The mentor takes on additional work, but has the satisfaction that parents have when they know that grandchildren will benefit from the parenting that is taking place" (p. 54). Mentoring is a way to create a legacy of sorts. I have been extremely fortunate to have worked under the guidance of some remarkable educators. I see the positive influences of my own mentors in those students whom I have coached. In turn, after thirteen years of coaching, I have been able to see glimpses of these same influences passed on to the students of my mentees. These types of experiences always call to mind one of my favorite quotations, "What greater joy in life then to love what you do and know that it matters."

References

Bennetts, C. (2002). Traditional mentor relationships, intimacy and emotional intelligence. *Qualitative Studies in Education, 15,* 155-170.

Buell, C. (2004). Models of mentoring in communication. *Communication Education, 53,* 56-73.

Gabbard, G O. (2004). On mentoring. *Psychiatric Times, 21,* 54.

Kalbfleisch, P. J. (2002). Communicating in mentoring relationships: a theory for enactment. *Communication Theory, 12,* 63-69.

McAuley, M. J. (2003). Transference, countertransference and mentoring: the ghost in the process. *British Journal of Guidance and Counseling, 31,* 11-23.

Young, J. P., Alvermann, D., Kaste, J., Henderson, S., & Many, J. (2004). Being a friend and a mentor at the same time: A pooled-case comparison. *Mentoring and Tutoring, 12,* 23-36.

Building Team Cohesion: Becoming "We" Instead of "Me"

Sheryl A. Friedley and Bruce B. Manchester, George Mason University

Abstract

Forensics fosters an appreciation for diversity; it embraces the unique qualities, characteristics, and talents that individual participants bring to the activity. Yet rarely does a forensics competitor attend a tournament as a single entry; instead, most students compete as a member of a larger group - a team. Because the activity recognizes success in individual as well as team effort, forensics educators realize that one of the most valuable skill sets students who participate in this activity can acquire is the ability to work as part of a team. Grounded in communication theory, this article discusses some of the unique opportunities the forensics activity offers to develop teamwork. Specifically, the authors focus on the source, channel, and content of messages that can be used to build a cohesive forensics team.

The very nature of intercollegiate forensics fosters an appreciation for diversity; it embraces the unique qualities, characteristics, and talents that individual participants bring to the activity. Whether students develop a persuasive argument, analyze a communication event, interpret literature, or critically assess a political situation, intercollegiate forensics encourages students to find their unique "voice" in this communication-based activity. Yet rarely does a forensics competitor attend a tournament as a single entry; instead, most students compete as a member of a larger group - a team. Because the activity recognizes success in individual as well as team effort, forensics educators realize that one of the most valuable skill sets students who participate in this activity can acquire is the ability to work as part of a team.

In 1979, Francis and Young defined a team as "an energetic group of people who are committed to achieving common objectives, who work well together and enjoy doing so, and who produce high quality results" (as cited in DeWine, 2001, p. 273). Though the concept of "team" has long been a model for athletic competition, the concept of "team" has also emerged over the past two decades as the prevalent model in business. In a study that asked corporate executives to identify qualities they most often seek in recent graduates, 71.4% of those corporate executives identified the ability to work in teams as a critical skill set (Tubbs & Moss, 1994). According to Chaney and Lyden (2000), "between 70 - 82 % of companies in the United States use the team concept, making teamwork skills one of the most necessary skill sets in the work environment; teamwork tends to promote creativity and problem-solving, high-quality decision-making, and improved communication" (p. 6). Furthermore, McManus (2000) distinguishes a "group" from a "team" in the workplace by noting that members of a team demonstrate a strong commitment to each other as well as the common end goal; "in a team, there is a higher degree of cohesiveness and accomplishment than in a group" (p. 21).

Since cohesion is believed to be one of the distinguishing characteristics of a high-performance team, what is this powerful team quality and how is it created? According to Bollen and Hoyle (1979), cohesion is the degree of attraction members feel toward one another and the team; "it is a feeling of deep loyalty, of esprit de corps, the degree to which each individual has made the team's goal his or her own, a sense of belonging, and a feeling of morale" (as cited in Beebe & Masterson, 2000, p. 122). Though cohesion is rooted in the feelings team members have for one another as well as a common goal, creating, shaping, and strengthening those feelings relies on the use of effective communication. Communication scholars have long agreed that group or team cohesion is as much about the relationships created as the task at hand, and success in both fosters the development of team cohesion (Bormann, 1990).

Since building team cohesion is grounded in effective, constructive communication about relationships as well as the task at hand, intercollegiate forensics seems an appropriate educational context in which to explore building team cohesion. Specifically, to discuss how best to develop forensics team cohesion, let's briefly consider three basic aspects of cohesion messages used in building forensics teams: 1) the source of cohesion messages, 2) the channel of cohesion messages, and 3) the content of cohesion messages. In examining these three aspects of cohesion messages, we hope to reinforce some of the unique opportunities intercollegiate forensics provides to build team cohesion and strengthen teamwork skill sets.

Source of Cohesion Messages

As with most team-building experiences, powerful messages about the nature of relationships among team members and the task at hand begin with those who hold strong leadership positions. Within forensics programs, directors, assistant directors, coaching staff, and team leaders are primary sources of communication for the team. Clear and consistent messages about the value of **this** team experience and what it means to be a member of **this** team are critical from the outset of team formation. Clear and consistent messages about how members of **this** team behave, in their relationships with coaching staff and other team members as well as their preparation for intercollegiate forensics competition (the task at hand), are critical throughout team development. This vision and identity can be reinforced by having former team members serve as members of the coaching staff. Such messages must be sent clearly and reinforced consistently beginning with top-down leaders of the team. These messages lay the foundation for a team vision as well as a team identity, and team cohesion is created when members have a clear understanding of that vision and identity. Another successful strategy is to have key administrators (department chair, college dean, vice-president, etc.) link the team's vision into that of the institution as a whole.

While it seems as though each academic year spawns the creation of a new team that becomes a "work in progress," continuity in leadership facilitates team cohesion. Allowing the current team members to select from their ranks the cap-

tain or officers for the next year's team can serve to ensure the desired continuity. Additionally, veteran team members can be paired up with rookie members thus creating a "big brother/big sister" mentoring support system. With retention of team directors, assistant directors, coaches, and members, consistent messages about team vision and identity are easier to sustain and perpetuate. For this reason, as well as many others, forensics educators must be given the necessary support to build a program over time; key leadership changes every year or two make it difficult to build team cohesion. College and university administrators should consider this aspect of team-building as they strive to support forensics educators in ongoing program development.

Channel of Cohesion Messages

With the advent of technology as a primary channel of communication in the workplace, Hallowell (1999) urges us not to lose the "human moment" in our communication - not to lose the powerful impact of face-to-face, immediate interaction in real time and space. Though the forensics team experience has been enhanced by the development of technology (internet searches for supporting material and email conversations among participants within and between teams), the forensics team experience itself continues to foster the "human moment" in communication. Forensics teams practice, travel, and compete in real time and space; they thrive in the powerful impact of face-to-face, immediate interaction of students, coaches, and judges.

It is communication in the "human moment" that most powerfully creates team synergy - the energy that truly makes "the whole greater than the sum of its parts." It is communication in the "human moment" that also most powerfully creates team cohesion - a strong sense of loyalty and commitment to the team vision as one's own. Encouraging others to succeed, sharing the excitement of others' successes, owning as well as taking pride in team success, and receiving support from others to succeed creates a synergy that builds team cohesion. Providing an environment where synergy is created through "human moment" experiences such as these (both inside and outside the competitive arena) is not only possible within intercollegiate forensics, but it is essential.

Providing communication opportunities in real time and space for forensics team members is necessary to build team cohesion. Whether a room or lounge where team members can congregate between classes and the end of the day, practice space for formal and informal coaching sessions, travel time in cars and vans, or social time to enjoy pizza and a movie, both quantity and quality of communication are necessary to build a cohesive team climate of openness and trust. By establishing periodic meeting times for coaches and/or team members to discuss openly issues related to the team, the director can facilitate the creation and maintenance of this cohesive unit. According to Bormann (1990), highly cohesive groups interact in an open climate where individuals are free to ask questions and disagree with one another; even the ability to work through inevitable team conflict in such a constructive climate will only serve to strengthen team cohesion.

Again, the "human moment" experiences preserved and perpetuated in intercollegiate forensics provide a powerful team experience that can only serve to strengthen student transition to the workplace.

Content of Cohesion Messages

Through the development of symbolic convergence theory, communication scholars have long recognized that groups and teams take on a life of their own; over time they develop a collective consciousness with shared feelings, motives, and meanings. Bormann (1990) explains that this "group consciousness" evolves as group members share group fantasies or stories; these stories tend to develop around central themes and, as such, begin to shape a "shared vision" for the group or team. As with any stories and themes that emerge, they reflect as much about what actually happened as they do about the interpretation of what actually happened. Recalling these stories and themes provide insight into the group's personality, values, and identity.

For example, the story of the "rookie" who narrowly qualified to attend nationals and then went on to become a national finalist offers hope for success and team value to even the most novice of competitors. Or the story of the team member whose luggage was lost on the flight to nationals and, having no clothes to wear for competition, was loaned a shirt by one team member, a tie by a second team member, a suit by a third team member, and shoes and socks by a fourth team member; thanks to team support (family support) in a time of need, this competitor became a true "fashion icon" during competition that day. Every team has its stories, its songs, its rituals, its rites of passage, and its traditions; when combined, these shared experiences create a strong sense of team identity and team cohesion.

This "shared reality" also creates a sense of past, present, and future for the team - a connection to those who have preceded them (alumni) and those who will follow. Such "shared reality" place the "here and now" into a larger context of program history - a legacy of what has come before and what will follow. Whether seeking alumni support (coaching, judging, or financial) or explaining to a current team member why a specific policy is necessary to ensure this program's future, owning responsibility for a forensic program's past, present, and future provides a strong context for building team cohesion. Creating opportunities for alumni to interact with current team members in a social setting can facilitate this connection. Team alumni can be invited to campus to share their experiences about the team with newly recruited members. Another strategy is to solicit letters from alumni to be read to the current team as they prepare for an upcoming national tournament. Such opportunities can create important connections that link the team's present with its past as well as providing a vision of its future.

In his recent article entitled, "What Makes Great Teachers Great?", Ken Bain discusses several principles of good teaching; among them, he notes that good teachers "create diverse learning experiences that help students learn out-

side the traditional classroom" (Bain, 2004, p. 9B). Intercollegiate forensics offers students just such an opportunity - the valuable opportunity to acquire the skills necessary to work as part of a cohesive, high-performance team outside the traditional classroom. To provide this opportunity for skill development under the tutelage of communication educators who can model effective communication skills and reinforce effective team-building behaviors will only serve to enhance the student's educational experience. Furthermore, the ability to create, shape, and sustain a cohesive team is perhaps one of the most rewarding experiences enjoyed by forensics educators. To empower individual students to create a shared vision, and rise to meet the goals and objectives of that shared vision, is to prepare the engaged citizen of the 21st century.

References

Bain, K. (2004, April 9). What makes great teachers great? *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 7-9B.

Beebe, S. A., & Masterson, J. T. (2000). *Communicating in small groups: Principles and practices* (6th ed.). New York: Addison Wesley Longman.

Bormann, E. (1990). *Small group communication: Theory and practice* (3rd ed.). New York: Harper Collins.

Chaney, L., & Lyden, J. (2000, January). Making U.S. teams work. *Supervision, 61,* 6.

DeWine, S. (2001). *The consultant's craft: Improving organizational communication* (2nd ed). Boston: Bedford / St. Martin's.

Hallowell, E. M. (1999, February). The human moment at work. *Harvard Business Review, 77,* 58-66.

McManus, K. (2000, April). Do you have teams? *HE Solutions, 32,21.*

Tubbs, S., & Moss, S. (1994). *Human communication* (7th ed.) New York: McGraw-Hill.

When "Van Talk" Steers Out of Control: A Theoretical Exploration of Team Traditions

Desiree Rowe & Daniel Cronn-Mills, Minnesota State University, Mankato

Abstract

Forensics traditions are classically perceived as positive motivators within the team dynamic. We illuminate, however, the disadvantages of team traditions after exploring the variables within team cohesion, and how those variables are applicable to the Burkean notion of consubstantiation. Finally, we offer a constructive framework for enacting forensic team traditions through a theoretical exploration utilizing the Foss and Foss paradigm for invitational rhetoric.

Forensic team traditions are bound by a level of secrecy. Our purpose is to cast a theoretical spotlight on team traditions and, thus, illuminate the strengths and weaknesses inherent in the traditions in which we engage. First, we establish a cursory framework for team communication, discussing group cohesion and the language enacted to facilitate cohesion. Next, we look at the negative impacts of tradition by applying our own organizational behaviors to the harsh gaze of Burkean consubstantiality. Finally, forensics traditions are closely illuminated within the context of invitational rhetoric.

Cohesion and Team Traditions

One goal of team traditions is to establish a bonding mechanism for holding a team together and building toward mutual goals. Thus, coaches and students must be aware of the sense of unity expressed within the interaction of the team. They must be conscience, in other words, of group cohesion. We address both the group-associated variables associated with cohesion, and how the language employed by a group is a symbolic representation of a group's cohesiveness.

The concept of cohesion, according to Yukelson, Weinberg, and Jackson (1984), is multidimensional. The dimensions include bonding of members, solidarity, harmony, commitment, connectedness (O'Reilly & Roberts, 1977), weness (Owen, 1985), strong ties (Granovetter, 1973), tightly coupled (Weick, 1976), satisfaction/dissatisfaction (Mudrack, 1989), forces acting on members (Festinger, 1950), resistance to disruptive forces (Gross & Martin, 1952), and group attractiveness (Festinger, Schachter, & Back, 1950). We believe an appropriate definition of cohesion is provided by Grubb (1987): "social cohesion is a function of the member's levels of involvement and types of involvement in social communication networks and clusters of networks" (p. 88).

Second, numerous variables have been tied to cohesion which should be reflected in team traditions:

- *Self disclosure* (Johnson & Ridner, 1974; Roark, 1989): Team traditions should take into account a level of disclosure among members. A true bonding within a team is only possible when the members are intimately

familiar with the personal lives involved. Team traditions should provide an opportunity for team members to invest in self-disclosure. Examples of such traditions may include informal team parties (with and without coaches present).

- *Acceptance* (Roark, 1989): Team traditions should be inclusive in allowing all members to participate, rather than exclusionary. Exclusionary traditions tend to generate an "us vs. them" mentality within a team, and tend to be more destructive than beneficial to the long-term production of the team.
- *Risk taking* (Stokes, 1983): Team traditions should recognize and applaud individuals who engage in behavior outside their comfort zones. For example, a tradition may "congratulate" someone who tries a new event (e.g., an interper trying her hand at extemporaneous speaking).
- *Group development* (Peteroy, 1983): Group development is one of the more complex dimensions of group cohesion. First, team traditions should provide for the new members of the team to be integrated into established team traditions. New members should not feel isolated or excluded because they are not yet aware of all the unwritten rules of the team. Second, the team traditions should provide for development by being flexible and adapting to new ideas from new members of the group. For example, team warm-ups may be changed as new members bring a variety of warm-ups into the program. Third, the development of the team should flow from the top down and from the grassroots up. The team traditions should reflect the philosophy of the director and should be generative from members up.
- *Task completion/performance* (Elias, Johnson, & Fortman, 1989; Littlepage, Cowart, & Kerr, 1989) and *productivity* (Elias, Johnson, & Fortman, 1989; Greene, 1989; Mudrack, 1989; Schachter, Ellertson, McBride, Gregory, 1951): Team traditions may build cohesion with the group by acknowledging performance and productivity. For example, a team may have a special "van chant" each time a speech has its first out round break or someone qualifies an event for a national tournament.
- *Metaphorical language:* Finally, teams must be aware of how language choices used to perpetuate team traditions may impact the overall functioning of the group. Owen (1985) demonstrated how metaphors may be used to examine language in order to determine the cohesive nature of a group. His study maintains that groups produce and reproduce cohesion "through metaphorical language use" (p. 415). Owen (1985) illustrates the process with sensory metaphors. Teams should regularly analyze and review the metaphors which support their own team traditions. The review should reflect whether the metaphors are appropriate or require a philosophical change in the team traditions.

Identification

The use of team traditions to establish cohesion within a group is intrinsically linked to the concept of identification. Identification is a process by which individuals may signal unity. Grubb (1987) states, "identification and cohesion are the same phenomenon perceived on different levels" (p. 88). Individuals may be characterized as dependent on the group and extremely ethnocentric. As noted by Osborn (1986), the process of identification provides the individuals involved with more than "identity," it also provides emotional security; "just to merge in the use of certain symbols is deeply reassuring" (p. 89). We wish to stress we are not articulating the notions of identification from a structuralist perspective (i.e., in the framework of Levi-Strauss, 1966; Leach, 1976). Rather, we are more in line with the Burkean perspective articulated by Gusfield (1989), "Burke presents a deep-seated pluralism. There is much more than one meaning, one possible interpretation, one possible 'structure.'... Burke's position is dynamic and dialectical in contrast to the present-day structuralists" (p. 17).

The essence of identification, as Hochmuth and others (Gibson, 1970; Thonssen, Baird, & Braden, 1981) have noted, is to provide a "common ground" between two individuals engaged in a symbolic interaction. The purpose of individuals is to attempt to create a commonality between them is to advance the dialogue/dialectic. Brock, Scott, and Chesebro (1989) state through language individuals are able to determine whether they wish to be associated or identified with other individuals, ideas, or institutions. This notion of identification is inherently tied with Burke's concept of consubstantiality:

> A is not identical with his colleague, B. But insofar as their interests are joined, A is identified with B. Or he may identify himself; with B even when their interests are not joined, if he assumes that they are, or is persuaded to believe so (Burke, 1969, p. 20).

When team cohesion is being built, the members of the team may be persuaded to believe they can identify with the other individuals. Within the realm of team dynamics, it is important to note this sense of cohesion may be fostered in both a negative and positive fashion.

Consubstantiation

Consubstantiation is noted as "a way of life as an *acting together,* and in acting-together, men have common sensations, concepts, images, ideas, attitudes that make them *consubstantial"* (Burke, 1969, p. 21). In forensics team development these concepts, images, ideas, and attitudes run the spectrum of earlier identified variables of cohesion. Our area of focus lies within the implementation of these variables as part of the students' identities through coercing consubstantiality.

The negative connotation of consubstantiality is noted within Burke for "the individual's identity is formed in reference to his membership in a group" (1973, p. 306), this formation of identity through acceptance is actively devaluing the perspective of the individual by placing the heavy mantel of tradition on the students'

shoulders. For example, if a student is participating in "van talk" and is forced to self-disclose more than she is comfortable with, she has forgone her own notions of comfort to be a part of the "team." Through this sacrifice, she has relinquished a portion of her own identity to mesh with the rest of her team. When dealing with consubstantiality as formulation of identity, it is impossible to "be one with them without contaminating ourselves in the process" (Kenny, 2003, p.672).

Consubstantiality creates a strong notion of the "insider/outsider" allowing the student to feel very absorbed by team tradition. This bond is "achieved (particularly in irony) by identifying outsiders, and an ironic catharsis that involves contempt for outsiders" (Kenny, 2003, p. 673). When students begin this identification of the "other" or outsider, the group cohesiveness is strong, yet at the expense of personal identity. Over time, as Burke explains "one's identification as a member of a group is a role" and *"individualistic* concepts of identity dissolve" (1973, p. 311). Once a student is aware of the ability to create group cohesion through the process of casting out the other, this creates a foundation for tradition building. A student can perform this action "again and again throughout life, in the naming and casting out of the offending object for the sake of social inclusion" (Kenny, 2003, p. 673).

When applying these notions of "casting out an other" to the realm of forensics the comparisons are endless. There are always rumors about students not being allowed to speak to members of rival teams, or making students feel uncomfortable if they do not self-disclose enough personal information for the satisfaction to the team. However, this negative aspect of team traditions is not the only one present in forensics. In email correspondence, Assistant Director of Forensics Dr. Todd Holm noted Concordia College (MN) has "a real emotional cleansing experience with cards and letters of support from teammates, family, and friends" (T. Holm, personal communication, April 28, 2004). This example of tradition leads to the next area of examination, invitational rhetoric.

Invitational Rhetoric

Burke acknowledges the impossibility of a totality of consubstantiation within group culture: "In being identified with B, A is 'substantially one' with a person other than himself. Yet at the same time he remains unique, an individual locus of motives" (1969, p. 20-21). This allowance for a level of individuality is a Burkean loophole for the exploration of invitational rhetoric. In their groundbreaking article, Foss and Griffin (1995) further substantiate the negative impact of consubstantial cohesion: "The act of changing others not only establishes the power of the rhetoric of others but also devalues the lives and perspectives of those others" (p. 3). Foss and Griffin believe this rhetorical power "infringed on others' rights to believe as they chose and in ways they believe are best for them" (p. 3).

When this is applied to the cohesion of a forensics organization, whose primary aim is to foster both originality and creativity among its members, another rhetorical method must be employed. Again, Foss and Griffin (1995) offer us another solution in invitational rhetoric.

The aim within the implementation of team traditions is to foster an environment for both personal growth and a strong sense of individuality. In invitational rhetoric the "change occurs in the audience or rhetor or both as a result of new understanding and insights gained in the exchange of ideas" (Foss & Griffin, 1995, p. 6). While the rhetor's (the established team) traditions are respected, the audience (an individual student) is still allowed both input and leeway within the realm of prevailing tradition. Seton Hall University Director of Forensics Jason Wood provides an excellent example: "At the end of warm-ups students stand in a circle. Each student speaks, this lets them get rid of jitters and nerves" (J. Wood, personal correspondence, April 28, 2004). Within this tradition, each student in allowed to voice their opinion in an open forum, free from judgment.

The implementation of invitational rhetoric within the team paradigm is an important step towards creating an open environment where the "rhetor does not judge or denigrate others' perspectives but is open to and tries to appreciate and validate those perspectives" (Foss & Griffin, 1995, p. 5). When upholding traditions, the team structure does not need to devalue the opinion of the individual, but rather be receptive towards the individual and their contribution towards the structure of the team. When this process takes place in open and honest forum "a greater understanding of the participants themselves can occur" (Foss and Foss, 2003, p. 7). The successful process leads to a stronger sense of both team unity and fosters the notion of community within the group.

Further, invitational rhetoric advocates the "asking of the group to engage in a shared ritual" (Foss and Foss, 2003, p. 28). The concept of the shared ritual is present in each of the above examples, and a myriad of other forensics traditions present in organizations across the country. We emphasize the implementation of invitational rhetoric within forensics programs does not require an abolishment of years of upheld traditions. Through invitational rhetoric does require the abolishment of an implicit power struggle between members of the organization. The struggle may be rooted in antiquated methods of persuasion, or an omnipresent patriarchal power structure, but those traditional means need not be upheld. If both coaches and students alike are encouraged to focus on the main principals of invitational rhetoric: "equality, immanent-value and self-determination" (Foss and Griffin, 1995, p. 5) strong competitors will not be produced. They will be home-grown. When those students do succeed, it will allow them to honestly thank and appreciate the family that guided them.

References

Brock, B. L., Scott, R. L., & Chesebro, J. W. (1989). *Methods of rhetorical criticism: A twentieth-century perspective* (3rd ed. revised). Detroit: Wayne State University Press.

Burke, K. (1969). *A rhetoric of motives.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Burke, K. (1973). *The philosophy of literary form.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Clark, Bonnie L. (1994, November). *Team Traditions: Building the Future on the Past.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Communication Association, New Orleans, LA.

Drescher, S., Burlingame, G, & Fuhriman, A. (1985). Cohesion. An odyssey in empirical understanding. *Small Group Behavior, 16,* 3-30.

Elias, F. G, Johnson, M. E., & Fortman, J. B. (1989). Task-focused self-disclosure: Effects on group cohesiveness, commitment to task, and productivity. *Small Group Behavior, 20,* 87-96.

Evans, N. J., & Jarvis, P. A. (1980). Group cohesion. A review and reevaluation. *Small Group Behavior, 11,* 359-370.

Festinger, L. (1950). Informal social communication. *Psychological Review, 57,* 271-282.

Festinger, L., Schachter, S., & Back, K. (1950). *Social pressures in informal groups: A study of human factors in housing.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Foss, S. & Foss, K. (2003). *Inviting transformation* (2nd ed.). Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press, Inc.

Foss, S. & Griffin, C. (1995). Beyond persuasion: A proposal for invitational rhetoric. *Communication Monographs, 62,* 2-18.

Gibson, C. (1970). Eugene Talmadge's use of identification during the 1934 gubernatorial campaign in Georgia. *The Southern Speech Journal, 35,* 342-349.

Granovetter, M. S. (1973). The strength of weak ties. *American Journal of Sociology, 78,* 1360-1380.

Greene, C. N. (1989). Cohesion and productivity in work groups. *Small Group Behavior, 20,* 70-86.

Gross, N., & Martin, W. E. (1952). On group cohesiveness. *American Journal of Sociology, 52,* 546-554.

Grubb, H. J. (1987). Social cohesion as determined by the levels and types of involvement. *Social Behavior and Personality, 15,* 87-89.

Gusfield, J. R. (Ed.). (1989). *Kenneth Burke. On symbols and society* (J. R. Gusfield, Introduction). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Hochmuth (-Nichols), M. (1952). Kenneth Burke and the "new rhetoric." *The Quarterly Journal of Speech, 38,* 133-144.

Kenny, Robert Wade. (2003). Thinking about *Rethinking Life and Death:* The character and rhetorical function of irony in a life ethics discourse. *Rhetoric & Public Affairs, 6,* 657-686.

Leach, E. (1976). *Culture and communication.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Levi-Strauss, C. (1966). *The savage mind*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Littlepage, G. E., Cowart, L., Kerr, B. (1989). Relationships between group environment scales and group performance and cohesion. *Small Group Behavior,* 20,50-61.

Mudrack, P. E. (1989). Defining group cohesiveness. A legacy of confusion. *Small Group Behavior, 20,* 37-49.

Mudrack, P. E. (1989). Group cohesiveness and productivity: A closer look. *Human Relations, 42,* 771-785.

Murray, Jefferey W. (2002). Kenneth Burke: A dialogue of motives. *Philosophy and Rhetoric, 35,* 22-49.

O'Reilly, C. A., Ill, & Roberts, K. H. (1977). Task group structure, communication, and effectiveness in three organizations. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 62,674-681.

Osborn, M. (1986). Rhetorical depiction. In H. W. Simons, & A. A. Aghazarian (Eds.). *Form, genre, and the study of political discourse.* University of South Carolina Press.

Owen, W. F. (1985). Metaphor analysis of cohesiveness in small discussion groups. *Small Group Behavior, 16,* 415-424.

Peteroy, E. T. (1983). Cohesiveness development in an ongoing therapy group. An exploratory study. *Small Group Behavior, 14,* 269-272.

Schachter, S., Ellertson, N., McBride, D.,t & Gregory, D. (1951). An experimental study of cohesiveness and productivity. *Human Relations, 4,* 229-238.

Stokes, J. P. (1983). Components of group cohesion: Intermember attraction, instrumental value, and risk taking. *Small Group Behavior, 14,* 163-173.

Thonssen, L., Baird, A. C, & Braden, W. W. (1981). *Speech criticism* (reprinted with new preface). Malabar, FL: Robert E. Krieger Publishing.

Weick, K. E. (1976). Educational organizations as loosely coupled systems. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 21,* 1-19.

Worthen, Tom. (1994). *Creating a Team Culture.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Southern Communication Association, New Orleans, LA.

Yukelson, D., Weinberg, R., & Jackson, A. (1984). A multidimensional group cohesion instrument for intercollegiate basketball teams. *Journal of Sports Psychology, 6,* 103-117.

Burned Out or Born to Run: Research and Directives on Forensic Coach Burnout

R. Randolph Richardson, Berry College

Abstract

Burnout is probably a remote concern for the coach who is establishing a forensics program. Experienced forensic researchers challenge forensic philosophy and practices, contending that burnout threatens the value of forensic activity and negatively affects the health of coaches and students alike. A review of forensic research reveals that while much is written about burnout, the phenomenon has yet to be measured in the forensic coaching community. The study advocates the use of the Maslach Burnout Inventory to gauge the level of burnout among coaches, and it calls for increased awareness of burnout literature in related disciplines. Burnout research in the forensic community and related disciplines confirms the existence of several conditions conducive to coach burnout. The study reiterates the need for an examination of competitive practices by forensic organizations and individual professionals. The author concludes by offering practical burnout-avoidance advice drawn from research.

If you are starting a forensics program, the following scenario may seem distant. Forensic coaches in program-maintenance mode may have already traveled this road.

You cannot stand the music anymore. It is sometime after 1:00 a.m. (or have you changed time zones?), and you are still hours from home with its comfortable bed, familiar bathroom and those people you recognize as family. It is the third swing weekend in a row and you hope you have won enough plastic trophies and generic plaques to justify your ever-dwindling budget. You thank God for novice events. Conversation would keep you awake, but coffee seems somehow more agreeable. They are asleep, have been for hours, even the chatty novice whose name escapes you. As you mentally construct the hyperbole that will become tomorrow's press release, you are jolted back to reality by the vulgar language and slightly more vulgar instrumentation blaring from the van's speakers. When did you start hating the music?

Thirty years of research reveals three definitional dimensions of occupational and professional burnout: emotional exhaustion, depersonalization and reduced personal accomplishment (Maslach, et. al., 2001). While it is possible that the aforementioned hypothetical van driver/director of forensics is simply experiencing physical exhaustion brought on by the rigors and stress of a tournament weekend, it should be noted that she displays the textbook signs of burnout. Stress should not be equated with burnout, but prolonged and chronic stressors may lead to burnout. Friedman (1991, p.325) identifies the overt manifestations of burnout in the educational setting as "...generally intense reactions of anger, anxiety, restlessness, depression, tiredness, boredom, cynicism, guilt feelings, psychosomatic symptoms, and, in extreme cases, nervous breakdown."

Discussions of burnout among forensic educators are as much a legacy of the activity as transitional walks and affected page-turns. Intuitively, forensic professionals know the problem exists and the experienced coach can support this contention with the kind of personal testimony and anecdotal evidence that is summarily dismissed in rounds of persuasive and impromptu speaking. And while the burgeoning chorus of lament is useful, even necessary to the solution process, convention panels and journal articles designed to repeat our experiential defeat do little to solve the problem that may seriously threaten the educational value of forensic activity. In order to understand and diminish the debilitating effects of professional burnout, forensic educators should focus more specifically on the nature and level of burnout in forensics and broaden their scope of perspective. Researchers from related disciplines, such as education and coaching, have defined, dissected, and addressed the concept of burnout since Freudenberger's seminal study in 1974. Three decades of scholarship offer profound insights for forensic philosophy and practice.

Forensics and Burnout

Forensic researchers appear to be aware of the concept of burnout long before the existence of the term itself. In 1965, a decline in debate activity led Rives and Klopf to ponder the question of why debate coaches quit. And while the intervening years spawned numerous studies indirectly related to the professional burnout, the question is not directly addressed by the larger forensic community until Gill's 1990 study. Gill initiates her quest based on the often-quoted notion that the professional life expectancy of a forensics coach is six years, a statistic referenced by Paine and Stanley (2003) as well. Perhaps the proof of this startling statistic lies buried in a convention paper, or in the writings of Corax and Tisias, but the time has arrived for rediscovery and replication. It should be noted that Gill's random sampling of active college forensics coaches seems to question the validity of the statistic, as nearly all of her respondents had been coaching for more than six years and the largest response group, 31 of the total 73, reported coaching for more than 16 years. Gill's study of why forensics coaches quit appears to be based largely on the perceptions of coaches who will never quit. However, Gill's finding that time constraints represent a significant predictor of forensic professional termination establishes a foundation for forensics burnout research. She also reports correlations between coach dissatisfaction and travel demands, training experience, and competition concerns.

Littlefield and Sellnow (1992) focus even more directly on burnout. Borrowing from Veninga and Spradley's (1981) construct of risk factors that promote burnout, Littlefield and Sellnow document the existence of several environmental risk factors including demanding schedule, lack of sleep, improper eating habits, elevated stress levels, inability to exercise and the tendency to consume more alcohol and tobacco. They offer several pragmatic solutions, which directly address most of the established risk factors. One can easily conclude from this

study that burnout likely exists in competitive forensics since the risk factors are present. However, the level of burnout itself is not determined.

Preston (1995) seeks to link coach burnout and "brain drain" with the credibility and survival of forensics activity. According to Preston, coach burnout results from several factors: length of season, pay, university research, priorities, funding, predatory recruitment practices, factionalism, and negative perceptions of forensics. The solutions to these problems include everything from shortening the tournament season to abandoning several forensic organizations. Preston opens interesting areas of discussion with intuitive insights regarding coach stressors. His criticism points toward the need for coach burnout assessment.

Paine and Stanley's (2003) search for pleasure in forensics led to correlations of perceptions of fun and levels of commitment among forensics students, coaches, and alumni. The authors found that coaches who valued creativity, risk-taking and a high degree of challenge for their students were less likely to derive pleasure from and be committed to forensic activity.

Several articles in the *National Forensic Journal's* (2004) issue devoted to wellness touch on the topic of burnout. Olson (2004) argues that an over-emphasis on competition fosters unhealthy practices. Among his list of factors that perpetuate the problem are season length, swing tournaments, and tournament length and rigor. Leland's (2004) gripping personal narrative highlights the seriousness of director's health issues. He seems to suggest that the "real cause of burnout" may be chronic health problems resulting from blatantly unhealthy practices. Leland not only echoes the corrective suggestions of others by addressing season length and tournament scheduling, but he goes on to contend that program philosophies and assessment measures need to be re-evaluated in light of wellness. Another factor that may be related to burnout is Hatfield's (2004) construct of academic wellness, which involves several tenets associated with a sense of accomplishment, the third definitional dimension of burnout.

Discussion

Several themes emerge from a consideration of forensic-coach burnout literature. Perhaps the most disturbing observation concerns the distance between research conclusions and forensics practice. The same time period that witnessed the birth of scholarly studies detailing the negative effects of extreme time demands and other competition-related stressors also featured the preponderance of swing tournaments, longer seasons and more taxing tournament schedules. And while Schnoor (2004), Trejo (2004), and Workman (2004) all offer positive exceptions to this trend, one can hardly argue that wellness is a dominant concern in the past 15 years of intercollegiate forensic competition. Another problem stems from a lack of scholarly attention to burnout. While several authors mention the term, few define it, and none operationalize or attempt to measure professional burnout. Until the nature, depth and scope of forensic burnout is established beyond the anecdotal level, forensic instruction, training and prescribed practice in this area will amount to little more than well-intended advice.

A final shortcoming of forensic burnout scholarship is the failure to build on the discoveries of researchers in closely related disciplines.

Forensic research reflects the findings and trends of burnout research in general in important ways. Investigations of burnout have considered the phenomenon from two perspectives: individual causation and environmental causation. Individual studies focus on personality characteristics and intrinsic motivations that contribute to burnout. Environmental causes include institutional factors, political pressures and other extrinsic variables. Leland's (2004) reference to coaches' unwillingness to make wellness a priority and Olson's (2004) description of competition addiction represent individual attitudes and behavior contributing to burnout. Preston (1995) and Littlefield and Sellnow's (1992) lists of university, tournament and program pressures reflect environmental causation. Friedman (1991, p. 325) reports that "Researchers have reached the conclusion that although a person's characteristics and personality establish...the propensity to burnout under certain work conditions, the main cause for the majority of cases of burnout is environmental." Forensic studies accurately depict the complex causation and the relative significance of environmental factors in burnout.

A reconsideration of the three definitional dimensions of burnout (emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, lack of accomplishment) in the context of forensic research is enlightening. Nearly all authors focus directly or indirectly on physical and emotional exhaustion. Time demands, tournament schedules, length of season, competition stressors and unhealthy habits are often linked with exhaustion. Gill (1990) concludes that time issues are clearly more important predictors than competitive issues. Olson (2004), on the other hand, links the two, suggesting that unhealthy time demands result from a misplaced emphasis on competition. On the surface, it seems reasonable that competition and the winning of awards would relate more to a sense of accomplishment than the other definitional dimensions. However, if Olson is correct, forensic activity may present a pattern in which coaches, striving for accomplishment, push themselves and their students to the point of physical and emotional exhaustion. Other issues dismissed by Gill, such as ethical concerns, may not be so easily ignored. If coaches believe that unethical behaviors are being rewarded, then the sense of accomplishment naturally related to award winning may be frustrated. Perhaps a coach feels that her students are not being rewarded at the level they deserve - and once again, the sense of accomplishment is frustrated. At a glance one might assume that forensic activity would serve to promote a sense of accomplishment, when, in practice, it could possibly be frustrating professionals to the point of burnout. These ideas are purely speculative and deserve further investigation. Another area requiring research is burnout's second dimension, depersonalization. Perhaps a survey, ballot analysis or tournament behavioral analysis would reveal waning personal contact among coaches with high levels of burnout. Another possibility is that depersonalization does not exist at any significant level in the forensic context. The personal interaction involved in forensic instruction may serve as an antidote to burnout. In this case, forensic educators would have much to contribute to burnout scholarship in general.

Contemporary intercollegiate forensics practice fosters conditions conducive to coach burnout. While many researchers point to extrinsic environmental causation, forensic professionals should also be aware of the central role played by intrinsic motivation. A coach's personal desire to succeed can result in overly competitive, unhealthy behavior. National forensic organizations, high profile programs and prominent tournament directors should take the lead in reducing burnout related conditions. However, every director of forensics must be aware that tournament decisions are a matter of choice. Novice forensic professionals need to establish practices and patterns of behavior with physical and academic wellness in mind.

Suggestions

The most compelling need arising from forensic burnout research is the necessity to determine levels of burnout among coaches. The Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) is a valid, reliable, time-tested instrument employed by researchers for over 20 years (Schwab, 1993). The instrument can be easily adapted to target forensic-specific issues. The National Forensic Association and the American Forensic Association could provide a valuable service to their membership by conducting these surveys at national conferences or tournaments. Not only could coaches be informed of their personal propensity for burnout, but the entire forensic community could gain an accurate reading of the burnout picture. The MBI measures the three dimensions of burnout, which would undoubtedly provide data for numerous, extensive research projects. Measuring burnout is a logical first step in combating the phenomenon on a professional level. If the burnout-related health risks are as serious as many suggest, then this research is both necessary and humane.

Another step in understanding forensic burnout involves attending to the findings of colleagues in related disciplines. Teacher burnout has received more extensive research attention than any occupational field (Pines, 2002). The vast majority of forensic professionals are teachers in the classroom, as well as the practice room, so the research implications seem particularly relevant. An exhaustive review lies beyond the scope of this paper, but even a glance at the literature is enlightening. Teachers who suffer from burnout are likely to neglect class preparation, while displaying inflexibility and apathy toward their students. They expect little from their students, display a low tolerance for frustration in the classroom, and feel emotionally and physically exhausted (Farber and Miller, 1981; Maslach, 1976). Education research correlates burnout with everything from student behavior patterns (Friedman, 1995) to teacher self-perception of existential significance (Pines, 2002). An especially insightful area of research involves music education (Stern and Cox, 1993; Hancock, 2002). Similarities regarding time demands, performance pressures, and competitive stressors between music and forensic educators are striking. Athletic coaches represent another group of professionals who share similar concerns such as recruitment, retention, competitive success, program goals and travel. Two studies with par-

ticular relevance for forensic professionals analyze the inevitable strain that exists for those filling the roles of both teacher and coach (Figone, 1986; Hebert, 2002). Others relate coach burnout to coach behavior (Price and Weiss, 2000), leadership styles and program goals (Ryska, 2002), and coach commitment (Granzyk, 2002). In the area of burnout, coaches offer valuable lessons which extend far beyond the playing field.

The challenges of starting and/or maintaining a forensics program can be daunting. At times, the rewards may seem few in light of enormous costs. When one reaches that point in the road, the following twelve pragmatic suggestions from researchers may help.

Twelve Suggestions for Combating Burnout

1. Be aware of the symptoms of burnout and learn how to self-monitor in the areas of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and lack of accomplishment (Friedman, 1991).
2. Build program philosophies and practices on values that transcend purely competitive goals (Ryska, 2002).
3. Choose tournaments that accommodate wellness (Olson, 2004).
4. Choose a lifestyle that accommodates wellness (Leland, 2004).
5. Balance work with personal, family and social opportunities and responsibilities (Burnett and Olson, 1998).
6. Work with administrators to determine reasonable program goals and assessment measurements (Maslach and Leiter, 1997).
7. Celebrate accomplishments (Newbrough, 1982).
8. Moderate perfectionist tendencies (Ostrow, 2003).
9. Reduce role conflict and ambiguity (Hebert, 2002).
10. Avoid organizational politics (Huang et. al., 2003).
11. Seek support (Bakker, 2003).
12. Laugh - employ humor whenever possible (Bennett, 2003).

The road to educational achievement and personal growth, development and fulfillment in forensics will no doubt feature an occasional late night van ride that transports you to a significant fork in the road. Before you arrive at what could be a dead end, remember it is how you traveled the road before that will impact your decision. And before you return to constructing tomorrow's, or now today's, press release, consider one final piece of advice offered by burnout research. Listen to your own inspiring music! Mental health counselors are employing music therapy to treat teacher burnout with great success (Cheek et. al., 2003).

You eject the CD of whatever it was that haunted the van's speakers. You crank up the Springsteen and head down the road.

References

Bakker, Arnold B. (2003). Specific determinants of intrinsic work motivation, emotional exhaustion and turnover intention: a multisample longitudinal study. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology.* Retrieved May 26, 2004 from High Beam database.

Bennett, Howard J. (2003). Humor in medicine. *Southern Medical Journal.* Retrieved Feb. 25, 2004, from High Beam database.

Burnett, A. & Olson, C.D. (1998). The dark side of debate: The downfall of interpersonal relationships. *Speaker and Gavel,* 35, 31-45.

Cheek, James R. (2003). Using music therapy techniques to treat teacher burnout. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling* 25(3), 204-218.

Faber, B.A. & Miller, J. (1981). Teacher burnout: A psychoeducational perspective. *Teacher College Record, 83,* 235-244.

Figone, Albert J. (1986). Teacher-coach burnout: Avoidance strategies. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance.* 57(8), 58.

Freudenberger, H.J. (1974). Staff burnout. *Journal of Social Issues, 30,*159-164.

Friedman, I.A. (1991). High- and low-burnout schools: school culture aspects of teacher burnout, *Journal of Educational Research,* 84, 325-333.

Friedman, Isaac A. (1995). Student behavior patterns contributing to teacher burnout. *Journal of Educational Research, 88(5),* 281.

Gill, M. (1990). Why forensics coaches quit: A replication and extension. *National Forensic Journal, 8,* 179-188.

Granzyk, Thacy L. (2002). Coaching commitment and turnover: A comparison of current and former coaches. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport.* Retrieved Feb. 25, 2004, from High Beam database.

Hancock, Carl B. (2002). Support for music education: A case study of issues concerning teacher retention and attrition. *Arts Education Policy Review.* Retrieved Feb. 25, 2004, from High Beam database.

Hatfield, Susan (2004). Forensics and the "new" wellness. *National Forensic Journal, 22*(1), 23-33.

Hebert, Edward P. (2002). Perceptions of occupational stress and strategies for avoiding burnout: Case studies of two female teacher-coaches. *Physical Educator.* Retrieved Feb. 25, 2004, from High Beam database.

Huang, Ing-Chung, Chuang, Chih-Hsun Jason, & Lin, Hao-Chieh (2003). The role of burnout in the relationship between perceptions of organizational politics and turnover intentions. *Public Personnel Management.* Retrieved Feb. 25, 2004, from High Beam database.

Leland, Chris (2004). The health of directors of forensics. *National Forensic Journal 22*(1), 12-22.

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

Maslach, C. (1976). Burned-out. *Human Behavior, 9,* 16-22.

Maslach, C. & Leiter, M.P. (1997). *The Truth about burnout: How organi-*

zations cause personal stress and what to do about it. San Francisco, CA, Jossey-Bass.

Maslach, C., Shaufeli, W., & Leiter, M.P. (2001). Job burnout. *Annual Review of Psychology, 52,* 397-422.

Newbrough, Art (1982). Twelve steps towards revitalization for teachers. *Education,* 703(3).

Olson, Clark (2004). Diagnosing the SICKness in forenSICs. *National Forensic Journal,* 22(1), 2-8.

Ostrow, Ellen (2003). Clear the obstacles to a balanced life: are you a perfectionist? A pessimist? An all-or-nothing competitor? If so, you may be headed for burnout. Avoid these traps, and you'll have a shot at long-term career satisfaction and personal happiness. *Trial.* Retrieved May 26, 2004, from High Beam database.

Paine, Richard E., & Stanley, John R. (2003). The yearning for pleasure: The significance of having fun in forensics. *National Forensics Journal,* 21(2), 36-59.

Pines, Ayala Malach (2002). Teacher burnout: a psychodynamic existential perspective. *Teachers and Teaching: theory and practice, 8(2),* 121-140.

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

Price, Melissa S., & Weiss, Maureen R. (2000). Relationships among coach burnout, coach behaviors and athletes' psychological responses. *The Sport Psychologist,* 14, 391-409.

Ryska, Todd A. (2002). Leadership styles and occupational stress among college athletic directors: the moderating effect of program goals. *The Journal of Psychology.* Retrieved Feb. 25, 2004, from High Beam database.

Schnoor, Larry (2004). A perspective on wellness. *National Forensic Journal,* 22(1), 37- 39.

Schwab, Richard 1. (1993). Teacher burnout: Moving beyond "psychobabble." *Theory Into Practice,* XX11 (1), 21-26.

Stern, Abby, & Cox, James (1993). Teacher burnout the dull reality. *Music Educators Journal, 80{3),* 33.

Trejo, Mary (2004). Nutritious, plentiful, easily accessible and especially free: A modest experiment in wellness. *National Forensic Journal,* 22(1), 40-42.

Veninga, R.L. & Spradley, J.P. (1981). *The work stress connection: How to cope with job burnout.* Boston, Little, Brown and Company.

Workman, Thomas (2004). The AFA-NIET initiatives on wellness. *National Forensic Journal,* 22(1), 34-36.

Building an Endowment

Edward A. Hinck, Central Michigan University

Abstract

Directors of programs have increasingly been called upon to assist with or engage in fundraising activities. Although fundraising is important to the financial health of programs they are also time-consuming activities that are often not included in criteria for tenure and promotion. This paper argues that development efforts are important for securing the resources for the future but must be managed carefully to ensure a director s professional obligations can be satisfied while meeting expectations for tenure and promotion. The paper is based on four assumptions. Fundraising efforts will be more successful when directors can (1) create a community of alumni, (2) nurture that community through frequent contact, (3) explain the needs of the program, (4) and communicate a program s accomplishments. Given these assumptions, a strategy for developing the social networks necessary for fundraising activities is offered.

Speech and debate programs are vital components of departments of speech communication and colleges of communication, fine arts, and liberal arts (McBath, 1984). Increasingly, however, as financial pressures are brought to bear on colleges across the country, directors would be wise to seek external sources of support for their programs.

The first step is to understand the history of one's program so that a director might create a forensic community composed of alumni competitors "across the decades." Knowing whom the alumni are and building a network of prospective donors is necessary to creating an audience for your appeals. Second, directors should develop communication campaigns designed to activate desirable team memories, convey the needs of the program, and build relationships of goodwill and support—a kind of social capital (Putnam, 2000)—that might take the form of a financial investment in the future of the program at some point in time. The last consideration, however, concerns the challenges that fund raising poses to directors in relation to competing professional priorities. Directors, tenured and untenured, younger and older, face a number of challenges in seeking to develop an endowment for their program. This paper argues that, while fund raising is a time consuming process, it is manageable and necessary to the long-term viability of a program.

Understand the History of Your Program

To build an endowment, a director needs to discover the history of the program. Further, directors should realize that they are responsible for sustaining the story of their program by creating memories for students who represented the school during their tenure as director.

Tell the Stories of Your Program

All teams have histories-stories about that time a specific group of students came together for a season. Each season is unique with its own seasonal highlights, legendary competitors, moments of commemoration, memorable adventures, cast of characters, etc., that make up the historical memory of competing on a college team. Directors need to know whom the competitors were in the past, when they competed, what they achieved, and what was significant for the students for each given season.

Assuming that one has just taken a position as director, that you have successfully recruited a team, created a tournament schedule and completed all of the other tasks necessary to starting a season, you should carve out time in your schedule to research the history of the program. Many colleges have yearbooks with the names of team members, pictures of teams, and highlights of the season. In addition to reviewing yearbooks, consider exploring departmental archives for names of team members, seasonal highlights, photos, etc., as well as interviewing past directors and team members who are available for reminiscing.

Modern technology allows us to recreate that information and those images in digital form making it accessible to team members across the decades. So having gathered team history from yearbooks, team archives, departmental closets, past directors and students, etc., the next step is to develop a website with all of this information provided for alumni to visit. This is a significant amount of work and unless a director is familiar with the technology should seek a student assistant or departmental support for completing this task. Depending on the amount of work, departmental requirements, and a director's vision for the website, in some cases, it might be appropriate to offer a student academic credit in the way of an Independent Study for completing a team history.

While websites are as creative as their designers can be, at a minimum, you need a cover page providing current information about your program: Director's name and contact information, types of speech and debate activities the program pursues, a brief mission statement of the educational objectives for the program, how to join the team, scholarship availability, and links to the history of the program, current tournament schedule, special events planned (for example exhibition debates or tournaments to be hosted), information for alumni (for example, how to make a contribution to an endowment fun), and announcements for alumni events. When alumni click on the link to the history of the program, they should be able to find their name, tournaments attended and awards won in a given season, and photographs of team members. Finally, directors should verify that the webpage and its links are consistent with departmental, college, and university standards for official university web-based documents.

Write the History of Your Program

Assuming you have the history up for alumni to view, you need to make sure that you preserve the history while you serve as director. My advice is to pre-

pare a year-end forensics report that details the activities of your program: names of competitors, tournaments attended, possibly what they majored in, awards won, team sweepstakes awards won, exhibition speeches and/or debates given, service activities, team officers, and any other honors worth noting over the course of a season. Some programs have awards for Most Improved, Most Successful, Peer Appreciation, Team Spirit, etc. Those awards can be noted in the report as well.

The forensics report works as both a historical document and a public relations tool. A director can list highlights on a page of the report, take a paragraph to explain the significance of a particular award or tournament, or note the achievement of an important team goal. The report can serve as an overview of the program for prospective team recruits as well as a way of communicating the activities, value, success, and unique showcase of a college's most talented students to administrators and community members who are unfamiliar with speech and debate activities.

Knowing the past of your program and creating the history to add each year provides a way for you to activate the memories of your alumni and build a positive image of your program in the university and local community. Once you have the messages to appeal to teams of the past, you will have reconnected past team members with current ones and reminded the alumni that future teams can advance the traditions, success, and educational values of the program with their support. A team website provides a cheap, efficient, and timely way to communicate with alumni especially as you develop your vision for hosting alumni events.

Communicate with Your Alumni and Program Supporters

Once you have a historical understanding of your program, coordinated with your development office to build a mailing list, and created a website for alumni to access, you need to communicate with your alumni and prospective supporters. There are five main strategies for contacting and interacting with alumni: internet channels, direct letter campaign from you, contact by college development officer, creating alumni networks and alumni events, and following through on building and maintain positive relationships.

Internet Channels

Internet channels involve at least two elements. The first is the program's website. Here the history of the program can be uploaded along with the forensics report for each year. The website allows alumni to contact you. However, the forensics report can also be burned on a CD possibly with photos and sent to alumni, or distributed as an email attachment in text form for convenient mass distribution via the internet to alumni on an email list. Contacting your constituencies through email allows you to craft appeals for support, explain the needs of the program, announce the generosity of other donors, thank contributors for their support, etc., in an efficient and timely fashion.

Direct Letter Campaign

A letter from the director is a second strategy. Enlisting the support of former program directors helps as well. It is important to describe the program's needs. Most former competitors understand the need for scholarships and to some extent the cost of equipment and supplies. However, if you seek the support of local business leaders, members of the community, or a specifically targeted group of professionals that might be willing to support speech and debate activities, you need to build a case. First, you need to describe what speech and debate activities entail. Second, you need to explain why tournaments are vital forms of educational experience. Third, you need to translate your needs into terms your audience understands. Why is it necessary to have portfolios to carry around visual aids, or financial support for ten students creating visual aids, or boxes to carry debate evidence or extemp files, or a laptop computer for a debate tournament? Why is it important to send students to a national tournament? And why must we send so many students to a national tournament? What's the significance of having a fund for Interstate Oratory if there were no guarantee your students will qualify each year? While we understand the reasons for these expenses our audiences might not.

Develop a repertoire of appeals. Different individuals are motivated by different arguments and combination of appeals. Barge (1994) has identified four broad classes of compliance gaining strategies that can be used by leaders: reward-based strategies, punishment-based strategies, altruism-based strategies, and rationale-based strategies. A list of possible appeals adapted to fundraising is provided in *Appendix A.* These strategies represent only a starting point for developing appeals for your alumni. However, regardless of what strategies you use, it is important to remember to adapt your appeals. Some alumni might be motivated by an appeal to altruism; others by pride in the program; yet others by an appeal to duty; or possibly by an appeal to reduce one's tax liability by contributing to the program. Sometimes appeals can be combined in ways to maximize effectiveness. To ensure your message is persuasive, use your knowledge of the program's history and your knowledge of the individual to whom you are appealing for funds when designing your message.

Coordinating with the College Development Office

Another form of contact is through your college development officer. First, a director needs to create a partnership with the college Development Officer. This is necessary to obtain sources for contacting alumni. More importantly, working with your college development officer prevents confusion about funding priorities. Often, a college development office is working on a number of projects. Funding sources tend to be classified in two ways. Private sector funds might come from alumni, community members, and corporations. Funds might also be obtained from the public sector in the way of grants to support a program's activities in the community.

Not every potential donor can fund every request. Typically, administrations create priorities. If you cooperate with your development officer, you are more likely to enjoy their assistance when the time is right for the administration to prioritize your program needs. Second, in some cases, you might want to approach an alumnus or community member who has had a successful career to request support for a special project, for example, a specific type of scholarship or a post-season travel fund. Development officers have the time, the training, and the experience in cultivating these contacts that, in some cases, is needed but not necessarily in your repertoire of skills or time constraints as a busy director. In this instance, it is vital to communicate your needs clearly to your development officer so that s/he can present that to possible donors, whether they are alumni or not.

Alumni Networks and Alumni Events

It is essential to activate alumni networks. A director should identify alumni who were team leaders in a given era and ask them to lead a campaign seeking support for a component of the program. Often, an appeal from a director and a former teammate create a more compelling appeal for support. When an alumnus contacts teammates from a particular era with the request to build financial support for the program, the appeal can be perceived as more personal, more credible, and possibly more urgent. The idea is to create an alumni culture of cooperation in building a vision of program support.

A final way of reestablishing and developing alumni connections is through alumni events. Directors need to be creative. Alumni events can be as simple as reunions. Or directors might want to build an annual event into the program's calendar. Hosting an annual tournament or having a team banquet at the end of the season with an open invitation for alumni to return are at least two examples. A director could issue a challenge to the debaters of one era to debate debaters from another. A director could invite alumni back to reprise their performances in one or more events. Alumni events need not be built around speech activities if they prefer to golf, camp, play tennis, etc. The most important element is to recreate community, to connect the alumni with the current students and current program so that a renewed sense of commitment and value takes place on the part of the alumni.

It is important to plan campaigns in coordination with the development office. You should identify major prospects for large contributions and keep an up to date list of individuals to approach. While those major prospects might take time to establish and nurture, do not hesitate to create a culture of support with smaller donations. A sizable endowment can be established with smaller donations, given annually, by a wide network of supporters. However, campaigns should be developed with as much attention to strategy to ensure the best use of your time. Nurture annual generosity as much you can.

Follow Through

Building an endowment should be about the values of communication, relationships, and staying connected as a community. Not everyone has money to contribute when they are contacted, but in ten, fifteen, or twenty years, they might have something to contribute. In this respect, it is important to maintain contact, stay in touch literally and figuratively whether contributions flow or not. Keep alumni and prospective supporters informed of the program's activities, competitive success, educational values, and needs. When a contribution is made, say "thank you." Write thank you notes and get the students to help. Tell donors who the money supported, how it helped, how much closer you are to the goal, the vision, etc. Knowing what is accomplished with one's contribution is vital to maintaining the relationship and the motivation to donate when funds are available.

Challenges for Directors

Fund raising is rarely described as a part of a director's job and probably not covered in many directing speech activities courses at the graduate level. Yet who would be more uniquely suited for the task of communicating and persuading others to support a cause like a forensics endowment than a forensics director? Still the demands of fund raising need to be acknowledged.

First, fund raising places increased demands on a director's time. Directing speech activities already is a time consuming activity. To manage the pressure, directors should develop a multi-year plan with specific objectives identified for each year. This focuses efforts on achievable goals, staves off frustration or disappointment, lets fund raising coexist with other professional priorities, and reflects steady progress toward the goal.

Second, directors need to sort through conflicting professional priorities and get advice from department chairpersons regarding where fund raising fits into evaluating him/her in relation to teaching, research, service, and professional activities. With that feedback, it might be necessary to revise the multi-year endowment building objectives if tenure demands take precedence.

Third, a director should seek support from alumni, from current students, from previous directors, from the departmental office, and from the development office. Building an endowment, like building a successful program, should be a team effort utilizing the resources of everyone available for the task. Chances are that you do not have all of the skills, information, time, or energy to complete the task yourself.

Fourth, building an endowment is a process that unfolds over decades. It is important to start building relationships now. Your program might not become endowed under your tenure but with a dedicated effort, it is possible to build a foundation for the future. Investing your efforts now will pay dividends later for future directors and future students who come to represent your college as you have during your career.

References

Barge, J. K. (1994). *Leadership: Communication skills for organizations and groups.* New York: St. Martin's.

McBath, J. H. (1984). Toward a rationale for forensics. In D. W. Parson (Ed.), *American forensics in perspective* (pp. 5-11). Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association.

Office of Development and Alumni Relations of Central Michigan University, (2002). *Ways to give.* Indianapolis, IN: Pentera.

Putnam, R. D. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American communitv.* New York: Simon & Schuster.

Appendix A

Reward-Based Strategies

Ingratiation: The director offers compliments or praise before asking for support.
Example: "The contribution you made to the team in 2001 was essential to the many team sweepstakes awards we won that year. I am writing to you now in the hope that you can contribute again so that the team will have the resources it needs for the future."

Promise: The director promises some kind of exchange in return for the contribution.
Example: "While a one-thousand dollar contribution seems like a great sum of money, I want to point out the tax benefits of supporting the endowment. 'The net cost of a $1,000 cash gift to a donor in the 30% marginal tax bracket is only $700 after his or her $300 tax savings.' And this does not count any deduction you might have from your state income tax." (Quotation taken from CMU Development Office brochure, *Ways to Give.)*

Debt: The director refers to a past obligation or debt as a way to gain a financial gift for the endowment.
Example: "When you competed for our team, you were supported with a generous scholarship. I'm writing now to explain that your scholarship was made possible by a generous alumnus who remembered how much the program helped her in her career. I'm hoping that you can see the only way for us to support excellent students is through the generous contributions of alumni, of which you are now one." **Positive Self-esteem:** The director explains that there will be a positive psychological benefit to contributing a gift to the program.
Example: "Your gift to the program will be appreciated by all of the students who qualify for nationals this year and the years to come. Your contribution makes national tournament travel possible for our students."

Positive Moral Appeal: The director indicates that contributing is part of a larger ethic of generosity, of giving back to the program that supported them.
Example: "One of the few things we have control over is own generosity. At times like these, it is important to do the right thing, to become part of the larger family of friends for the speech and debate endowment."

Allurement: The director notes that by complying the contributor will be noticed by others.
Example: "A $1,000 contribution makes you a member of the Gold club and your name will be listed among the others who have generously donated funds in the Annual Alumni Honor Report, a report well read by the alumni community."

Punishment-based Strategies*

Threat: The director explains that the excellence, competitive success, or reputation of the program with which the prospective donor identifies will suffer unless contributions are made.
Example: "Unless loyal alumni like yourself choose to support the endowment, our competitive success will falter."

Aversive Stimulation: The director indicates that unless contributions are made, the program will continue to erode, or in a more humorous tone, some punishment like emails from other teammates will be visited upon the alumni until s/he complies.
Example: "Now is a critical time for the program. Unless financial support can be generated for a long term scholarship program, we will continue to lose gifted students in need of scholarships to other programs with greater resources."
Negative Self-esteem: The director informs the prospective donor, perhaps in a humorous way, that other alumni members of his/her team will regard his/her unwillingness to donate in a negative way.
Example: "All of the other E-Board members of the 2001 team have contributed generously to the endowment. So I'm writing to you again in the hope that you can avoid the enmity of your fellow teammates with a contribution to the endowment this year."
Negative Moral Appeal: The director argues that the alumni's behavior is wrong, inappropriate or unfair.
Example: "Not contributing when so many others have does not seem like the generous person 1 knew you to be as a member of the team in 2001." **Warning:** The director explains in a humorous way that not complying with the request for a contribution will result in some unwanted result. Example: "Should you fail to respond to our request for support, your name will be dropped from the honor roll of the team of the decade and like a Soviet-era history text your appearance in team photos will be erased, your name forgotten. Please donate!"
*It should be noted that directors have little, if any, reward and punishment power over alumni. "Punishment" strategies of compliance gaining should be used rarely, usually when attempting a humorous effect, and only when a director is absolutely certain that the strategy will be interpreted appropriately as a legitimate fear appeal about threats regarding the future quality of the program or as attempted humor.

Altruism-Based Strategies
Counsel: The director offers to help the alumni work with other alumni to accomplish fundraising goals.
Example: "Together we contact the other members of the team of 2001 and build a gift for the future competitors of the program. Please let me help you reconnect those memories so that others might consider giving to the endowment." **Favor:** The director asks the alumnus to comply with the request for a contribution as a favor to him/her.
Example: "I am asking for your support of the program. I need each and every one of the students from my time as director to come together to create this fund." **Duty:** The director explains that the alumnus has a duty to contribute to the fund. Example: "It is your duty as a (fill in the school mascot here) to help with the endowment fund."
Altruism: The director appeals to the alumnus' sense of well being of the team or the program.
Example: "Your contribution is the key to the future of the speech and debate program. Please consider making this vision of the future come true."

Rationale-Based Strategies

Direct Request: The director simply asks for financial support for the program.
Example: "We have been working on an endowment for the state championship and 1 am asking you to contribute to that fund."

Indirect Request: The director might set up an appointment to sound out, discuss, or frame a request for funds to a prospective donor.
Example: "I was hoping we might meet to discuss the future of forensics at Central Michigan University. I'm interested in hearing what your best memories were and I'd like to share some of the challenges we're facing next season."

Explanation: The director presents a case to persuade the prospective donor to comply with the request for support.
Example: "Since you have graduated you'd be surprised at the number of students who seek scholarship support, the ways in which travel costs have risen, and the needs for technology that programs have in order to remain competitive. Let me explain, for example, some of the ways our travel costs have increased..."