

Coast to Coast and Culture to Culture:
An Intercultural Perspective on Regional Differences in
Forensics Pedagogy and Practice

Jackson B. Miller, Linfield College

Abstract

The process of moving from one region to another in the U.S. may not be as jarring as immersing oneself in another culture by traveling abroad, but this essay maintains that coaching in two regions with distinct forensics cultures requires a comparable process of acculturation. Similarities and differences in forensics culture in two of the most geographically distant regions in the country, the Northeast and the Pacific Northwest, are discussed. This piece also examines the process of shifting from coaching in one region to another by applying the concept of culture shock to a first-person account of cultural immersion.

When I entered the space, it had a familiar feel, yet I could tell something was different. The interactions among the participants, the dialogue between teacher and learner, felt somehow changed. Some of the interactants were dressed in ways that seemed unfamiliar, given the context, and they seemed to take talk turns at times that, to me, seemed inappropriate. I was also accustomed to receiving a guidebook to detail the time and place of my upcoming interactions, but no such guidebook was provided. Instead, the information about meeting times and places was posted in a central location for all to see. When I arrived at my meetings, all seemed to be normal for the most part; however, the posting of results at the completion of the meetings came at the end of the day, a most unusual time compared to my previous experiences. Finally, when we reached the ceremonial portion of our weekend gathering, I noticed even more differences. The applause seemed to come at the wrong times, if at all; interactants engaged in vocal behaviors that seemed out of place; and the ceremony itself even started before all of the competition was completed. I left the experience feeling confused and disoriented.

The above excerpt is an attempt to describe, from an auto-ethnographic perspective, some of the observations and feelings I experienced at the first few intercollegiate forensics tournaments I attended in the Pacific Northwest. The coaching of debate teams prior to rounds ("dialogue between teacher and learner"), the lack of a schematic ("guidebook"), the timing of the final round postings ("results"), and the behavior at the awards assembly ("ceremonial portion") all contradicted my prior experiences in forensics culture. My background in intercollegiate forensics includes four years of competing in the Midwest and two years of coaching on the East coast, so my first exposure to tournament rituals in the Pacific Northwest came when I accepted my current position as director of a program in that region.

Around the same time that I started my new position, I also prepped and taught a new course in intercultural communication. The readings and discussions in this class naturally led me to start thinking in cultural terms about some of the differences I noticed between my previous forensics experiences and my current experience. The shift in region made me aware of the fact that, while there are certainly elements of forensics culture that transcend geographical location, there are also specific elements that vary considerably from one region to the next. Since geographical location is often part of what distinguishes one cultural group from another, I concluded that it would be useful to apply the cultural analogy to my current shift in forensics culture. Of course, I also believed that the critical analysis demanded by thinking about, discussing, and writing a scholarly essay on such a topic would help me come to a better understanding of these issues.

This project is an attempt at "writing as epistemic" because part of my goal in thinking about these issues and crafting this essay is to use writing as a means for better understanding my own experiences. The method that I employ in this essay is a hybrid of auto-ethnographic and critical/cultural approaches. Reed-Danahay (2002) explains the compatibility of these two approaches when she notes that autoethnography "can refer both to the autobiographical voice of the ethnographer who inserts him- or herself into the text, and to ethnography produced by an 'insider' or 'native' observer of his or her own cultural milieu" (p. 423). Baker (2001) further explains the connection between these approaches when he states that autoethnography "sees the researcher's own engagement with another culture as a part of the story rather than an invisible fact read only between the lines" (p. 400). Blending autoethnography with a critical/cultural perspective is appropriate for this analysis because it allows me to discuss significant elements of my own "multilayered lifeworld"; an "insider" view of the researcher consisting of personal experiences, shifts in emotional states, and a general awareness of cultural rules and practices (Duncan, 2004, p. 3).

The description of my experiences in my new forensics culture is an important element of this project, but the goal is not merely to describe the experience; instead, the purpose is to describe, understand, and critique the experience. First-person accounts have been used in previous research by scholars interested in intercultural issues (see, for example, MacLennan, 2002; Antal, 1998; Webb, 1983), but the focus on forensics communities as microcultures is unique to this study. Accordingly, this essay begins with an explanation of why the concept of culture shock is an appropriate focus for this analysis. Second, the phases of culture shock are applied to my experiences judging and coaching in my new region. Finally, some conclusions and implications are presented.

In taking the approach outlined above, where my stated goal is to use writing as a way of knowing, I hope not only to produce useful insights for myself but also to provide insights about some of these issues for the broader forensics community. With this in mind, I present the following research questions that will be addressed throughout the essay and which I will revisit in the conclusions section:

1. Can the application of the concept of culture shock produce worthwhile insights about shifts within microcultural environments like the intercollegiate forensics world?
2. In shifting from one region to another, is it healthier to embrace the beliefs and practices of the new culture wholeheartedly or to engage in critical dialogue on issues of difference?
3. To what extent should a coach change her/his pedagogical practices in an attempt to adapt to the new culture, and is it possible to resist such changes without projecting a "go it alone" mentality?
4. How much time should be given to the acculturation process, and what ultimately "legitimizes" a newcomer as a member of the community?

Regional Forensics Communities as Microcultures

Intercultural communication scholars widely recognize that, within any group that can be defined as a "culture," smaller pockets of individuals often form groups that function as cultures within the dominant culture. If the term culture is understood as "a set of patterns, beliefs, behaviors, institutions, symbols, and practices shared and perpetuated by a consolidated group of individuals," then the rationale for the formation of these smaller groups becomes apparent (Jackson & Garner, 1998, p. 44). These groups, which are often labeled "microcultures" or "co-cultures," allow individuals to develop a stronger sense of cultural identity in a world that is becoming increasingly multicultural. Individuals who get "lost" within the broader cultural framework, or who feel like the broader cultural framework does not do enough to define who they are, often find a greater sense of community within a microcultural or co-cultural group.

How do regional forensics communities function as microcultures? To make a strong case for viewing the intercollegiate forensics community as a microculture, we need to examine the sharing of common values, beliefs, and practices. Common characteristics along these lines include the shared sense of the value of competition, a belief in experiential approaches to learning, and a common desire to promote excellence in speaking skills. Allen, Berkowitz, Hunt, and Loudon (1999) point to a specific common trait among forensics participants when they note that those involved with competitive forensics are more adept when it comes to critical thinking skills. Cambra and Klopf (1978) also find evidence of shared behavioral and emotional characteristics when they conclude that forensics competitors "possess stronger inclinations toward verbal behavior and weaker control and affection needs than those who do not" participate in forensics (p. 87).

Although the research indicates some common characteristics among forensics participants, beliefs and values indicative of a distinct microculture can also be seen in the sharing of common practices. Everyone who has participated in intercollegiate forensics for any length of time is well aware of the "weekend

ritual" that is tournament travel. The shared experiences of packing, getting up early, driving long distances, and so on are enough to create a strong sense of identification among members of the forensics community. However, once at the tournament, other rules and practices are also common. Competitors and coaches alike are expected to follow rules about when and how to talk, how to dress, when to give feedback, what kind of feedback is appropriate, and so forth. These rules about how one should behave at a tournament are so much a part of our experience that we often do not look at them as rules; yet, to most experienced competitors and coaches, it is obvious when someone (either as a judge, competitor, or observer) is at a tournament for the first time because these "first timers" often violate one or several of these behavioral rules.

If, for the reasons outlined above, the intercollegiate forensics community can be considered a microculture, then how does one account for the numerous regional differences that exist within this microculture? Are the different geographic regions microcultures within the microculture? Prior to the experience of coaching in a different geographic region, I would have maintained that regional differences were not significant enough to warrant such a distinction. My exposure to students and colleagues in other regions was limited to national tournaments, to a few out-of-region tournaments I had attended, and to national conferences like NCA. After having the experience of adapting to a new region, and thus gaining a clearer perspective on exactly how many differences actually exist in terms of regional beliefs, values, and practices, I believe that the label "microculture" is indeed warranted for each region. In fact, a regional forensics community can be accurately described as a culture within a culture within a culture within a culture within a culture. The U.S. culture is the broadest cultural framework, the regional culture is the first microculture, the culture of the academy is the second microculture, the forensics community on the national level is the third microculture, and the forensics community on the regional level is the final microculture. Andersen, Lustig, and Andersen (1987) explain that differences in regional cultures within the U.S. are a product of "cultural or institutional plans, patterns, scripts, goals, values, attitudes, beliefs, views, and behaviors that are shared within a social region" (p. 129). While regional forensics communities share a great deal in common due to the broader cultural frameworks within which they exist, the differences in some of the areas outlined above are pronounced enough to present difficulties for an individual attempting to shift from one regional forensics community to another.

If regional forensics communities are viewed as distinct microcultures, then the concept of culture shock can be used as a means of understanding the process of learning and adapting to the norms of a new regional forensics community. Oberg (1960) was the first to use the term culture shock, but as Ferraro (1994) explains, it is now "used by social scientists and laypeople alike to define in very broad terms the unpleasant consequences of experiencing a foreign culture" (p. 146). Kohls (1996) explains that some of the major causes for culture shock are "being cut off from the cultural cues and known patterns to which you are familiar, living and/or working over an extended period of time in a situation that is ambigu-

ous," and "having your own values (which you had heretofore considered as absolutes) brought into question" (pp. 89-90). The feelings of disorientation, stress, and anxiety that result from culture shock have generally been found to last up to a year, and while the degree of culture shock varies greatly from one individual to another, "everyone who attempts to live and work in a strange culture can expect a negative experience for the first few months" (Zapf, 1993, p. 697).

Culture Shock East to West

Culture shock is a personal phenomenon. It is a state of dis-ease, and like a disease, it has different effects, different degrees of severity, and different time spans for different people. Few escape it altogether, but many people who are handicapped by its presence don't recognize what's bothering them, or even that they're not acting like themselves. (Barna, 1976, p. 1)

It has been almost four years since I made the transition from coaching on the East Coast to coaching in the Pacific Northwest. While the move across the country brought its own challenges in terms of adapting to a new geographical and cultural environment, for the purposes of this essay I am restricting my focus to the microcultural environment of the regional forensics community. However, there are a few instances where attributes of the broader geographical and cultural environment will be included in the analysis because they affect specific elements of the regional forensics community. I should say at the outset that this transition, while it has presented many challenges, has by and large been a positive experience. Most individuals who experience culture shock eventually adapt to the new cultural environment, and while my transition has not been without its hurdles, I feel that I have more or less adapted to my new microcultural environment. In the pages that follow, I attempt to describe my adaptation process by using the different phases of culture shock to discuss the transition.

Various models have been developed over the years in an attempt to define the stages of culture shock. Most of the contemporary models of culture shock include four phases or stages and are based on the U-curve hypothesis first proposed by Lysgaard (1959, p. 190). According to many of these models, the first phase of culture shock is the "tourist" or "honeymoon" stage. At this stage, the individual has a positive reaction to the stress, expresses an interest in the new culture, and has feelings of euphoria or elation. Kohls (1996) further describes this initial phase when he states, "at this point, anything new is intriguing and exciting. But, for the most part, it is the similarities which stand out. The newcomer is usually impressed with how people everywhere are very much alike" (pp. 93-94). The second phase is the active "culture shock" or "crisis" stage, where the positive feelings give way to confusion, frustration, stress, and disorientation. Lysgaard explains that at this phase individuals often experience "a feeling of loneliness" that "may be accompanied by 'projection' phenomena" where "one blames the society one visits for not providing human contact" (p. 190). The third phase is usually called the "adjustment" or "modification" stage. At this stage, the individual comes to a greater understanding of the new culture, and the

"events and people" in the new culture "seem much more predictable and less stressful" (Samovar & Porter, 2004, p. 296). Instead of blaming the new culture for their difficulties, individuals start to see their problems as resulting from their own inability or unwillingness to adapt. The fourth and final phase of culture shock is the "acculturation" or "adaptation" stage. At this stage, the individual "becomes integrated in social groups and feels more like a regular member of the community" (Lysgaard, 1959, p. 190). It is important to note this acculturation process is not a complete transformation; rather, the individual keeps parts of her/his previously established identity. M. J. Bennett (1998) explains that adaptation is a "process whereby one's worldview is expanded to include behavior and values appropriate to the host culture. It is 'additive,' not substitutive" (p. 25). As the analysis which follows demonstrates, transitions from one phase to the next in this model are not always smooth and direct; indeed, there is a fair amount of overlap between the four stages, for as Samovar and Porter (2004) contend, "the seam separating the stages is almost impossible to see" (p. 296).

Tourist Phase

My first exposure to the new culture was at a coaches' meeting in early September of 2001. The Pacific Northwest actually has a strong regional organization called the Northwest Forensics Conference (NFC) which includes programs from Alaska, Idaho, Montana, Utah, California, Oregon, and Washington. This regional organizational structure was new to me, since state organizations were the primary organizational unit in my previous forensics communities. The idea of having a coaches' meeting was also new for me. This coaches' meeting can be appropriately termed part of the tourist stage because I approached the meeting with a sense of excitement about meeting new colleagues and getting to know more about forensics in the region. While I definitely approached this meeting with a positive attitude, the subtle differences in cultural rules from region to region started to become apparent even at this early stage. At this point in my experience with the new culture, however, my positive attitude toward the situation probably made me oblivious to some of the conflicts that the regional differences could potentially create for me in the future.

One topic of discussion at this meeting was the rules for determining division placement in individual events. In particular, the definition of a "novice" in individual events was discussed. In my previous experience, a "novice" had always been defined as a competitor in his or her first full year of intercollegiate competition. However, rules of the NFC indicated that students with high school experience in particular events (interp, limited prep, and prepared speeches are considered separately) were not eligible for novice divisions. Another concept of which I became aware at this meeting was the inclusion of "junior" divisions in individual events. I had never heard of junior divisions in individual events, and while it did not come up as a topic of discussion at this particular meeting, the idea of running three divisions of individual events was certainly a new cultural rule to which I would have to adjust. Although the rules for determining novices

and the new concept of junior division seemed unusual at first, I was intrigued about the possibility of seeing these divisions in practice at a tournament.

The tourist phase continued into my first tournament trip of the fall, a parliamentary debate scrimmage which I attended with two first-year students who were every bit as new to the region as I was. This first tournament experience in my new culture was exciting to me on several levels. For one, I had only recently learned the rules and the procedures for parliamentary debate, and I was really eager to see this type of debate in action. I had done several practice rounds with my students, but practice rarely captures the excitement of actual rounds of competition at a tournament. The idea of a 15-minute preparation period and a new topic for each round of debate was something that I wanted to see in action. I was also eager for my students to get some experience debating against other teams. While both of my students had competed in debate in high school, they were both new to parliamentary debate. Because I was also new to the region, I was even a "tourist" in a quite literal sense; I was eager to make the drive to the tournament since the campus and the surrounding area were all unfamiliar to me.

I judged several rounds of debate at the tournament, and everything (at least as far as I knew as a "novice" parliamentary judge) proceeded normally. The only slightly unusual thing was that after one round several of the competitors asked me for feedback on their debate. While this idea of giving an oral critique to the competitors was a violation of my usual judging norms, the students who asked were true novices; since this was, after all, a "scrimmage," I decided that it would be appropriate to offer them some suggestions for improvement. Another difference I noticed at this first tournament was that students were consulting with their coaches during the preparation time for the debates. I was confused by this because, in my experience, this kind of coaching at the tournament was a violation of the ethics of forensics. I always go into a round to judge during any sort of limited preparation activity, such as parliamentary debate, extemporaneous speaking, and impromptu, assuming that the speech contains the original ideas of the student. In observing this practice, it struck me that if students are coached on their cases during the prep time, they are, in effect, simply reciting the ideas of their coaches instead of being challenged to think critically and come up with arguments and approaches to the topic on their own. Interestingly, my students, who had competed at the high school level in the Northwest, also thought that it was strange that so many students were being coached during prep time. At the time, I didn't grow too concerned about the practice, because I figured that it was just being done because the tournament was an early season scrimmage.

This first tournament experience left me with an overall positive view of my new regional forensics culture. The tournament ended with a banquet where students and coaches enjoyed a meal together and watched the final round of debate. I particularly enjoyed the hospitality and sense of community that the banquet provided. I had attended tournaments with banquets before, but never an early season scrimmage. This tournament allowed me to get to know some of the other coaches in the region, and I was impressed with the overall sense of enthusiasm for and dedication to the activity.

Culture Shock Phase

A tournament I attended later in the fall semester marked the beginning of the culture shock phase, a crisis of identity that results from the feelings of confusion and anxiety produced by the new cultural context. While I retained some of the optimism from the tourist phase, my positive outlook waned in the face of the numerous cultural differences I encountered at this particular tournament. This tournament included both individual events and debate, and I again traveled with a group of first-year students. In retrospect, the "newness" of the culture to my students probably did not help me in terms of adjusting to the culture, since the cultural rules and practices were as unfamiliar to my students as they were to me. The feelings of culture shock that I experienced started at this tournament and continued throughout the fall semester.

At this particular tournament, some of my discomfort was a result of significant differences in the way the tournament was run. First of all, when we arrived at the tournament we discovered that there was no schematic for the preliminary rounds of individual events. Instead of having a schematic for the entire tournament, students had to check at centralized posting areas before each round of competition to find out their room, speaker order, and judge. The lack of a schematic was not such a big deal, but it was something that caused some initial disorientation. Another significant difference I discovered at this tournament had to do with the timing of and the method for posting the names of the finalists in individual events. We finished the last preliminary round of competition late in the evening on Saturday, and finals in individual events were to follow on Sunday morning. I assumed that the final rounds would be posted Sunday morning, but instead they were posted late Saturday night. Also, the finals postings were on standard-sized sheets of paper as opposed to large posters. In fact, the posting sheets for the final rounds were exactly the same size as the preliminary round postings—there was not anything special about the posting of the names of the competitors who had qualified for the finals. This lack of variance in posting was a marked difference from my previous experiences; from my perspective, the idea of celebrating the individuals who qualified for the final rounds was somehow missing.

In addition to the procedural differences outlined above, I also took note at this tournament of several behavioral rules that differed somewhat from my previous experiences in forensics. For one, there was a good deal of variation in how coaches, other judges, and competitors dressed. These variations in dress are not that uncommon at tournaments across the country, since community members, graduate students, and other outsiders typically participate in the tournament by volunteering to serve as judges. What struck me as unusual, however, was the fact that some of the coaches (whom I had met previously at the coaches' meeting also dressed very casually, even to the extent of wearing jeans and t-shirts in a few instances. Also, the dress for competitors was all over the spectrum, from suits and very formal outfits on one end to much more casual dress on the other. The mix of formal and casual dress struck me as odd because it didn't provide me

with a very clear picture of the accepted cultural rules for tournament dress in the region. The awards assembly further confused me on this particular point, as many of the teams in attendance changed out of their competition dress and into their much more casual "travel" dress for the awards. Even students who were finalists in multiple events went down to receive their awards wearing t-shirts and jeans.

Overall, the confusing signals regarding dress created stress because it made me uncertain about my own nonverbal presentation of self. I couldn't help but wonder, "Am I dressed appropriately given the cultural rules?" This line of questioning also led to minor doubts about my judging philosophy. For instance, would it be appropriate for me to make comments about what I deemed to be overly casual dress on a ballot? I had always felt it was my duty as a judge to make students aware of how dress impacts their credibility, but I couldn't help wondering if such comments would be viewed as inappropriate within my new regional forensics community.

In addition to the differences with regards to dress, I also noticed some other cultural differences during the awards assembly at this particular tournament. A few of these differences have to do with cultural rules about appropriate behavior at the awards assembly. In my previous experiences as a competitor and as a coach, when a teammate received an award, the normal procedure was to applaud politely if at all so as not to appear self-congratulatory. However, at the awards assembly, the loudest and most vocal support for individual students (even some "hooting" and "hollering" in some instances) seemed to come from their own teammates. Also, I had grown accustomed to the ritual of standing to applaud for the first place finisher in each of the individual events, but this procedure was not followed at the awards assembly. The champions in each event were recognized with a full round of applause, but there was no standing ovation. In addition, the awards began before the semi-finals of debate had occurred. The participants in the semi-finals were announced at the awards ceremony, but the semi-final and final rounds took place after awards. This discrepancy was particularly confusing to me, because the eventual champions in debate would not be recognized by the group and because things such as sweepstakes awards could potentially be affected by the outcome of the debates. Another procedural difference that I noticed during the awards is that only the first, second, and third places were recognized in individual events. Although there were six finalists in each individual event, those placing fourth through sixth were simply announced as "finalists" in the event without any specific mention of which place they received in the final round.

Finally, and perhaps most disorienting to me, was the fact that the entire awards assembly had an air of "let's just get this over with and head home." In my previous experiences as a coach and competitor, the awards ceremony was always viewed as a time to celebrate the achievements of the students and teams participating in the tournament, and the general lack of celebratory spirit disappointed me. This was one of our larger regional tournaments, and I wondered why the community would take this attitude towards the awards assembly. Comparing

my experience to the previously discussed early season scrimmage, which featured a banquet awards assembly, further compounded my confusion. Overall, I felt like there wasn't even any consistency within the culture about what kind of a celebratory tone was appropriate for awards.

Another cultural difference that contributed rather significantly to my feelings of culture shock was also brought to my attention at this tournament, as I had my first opportunity to see how the novice, junior, and open divisions of individual events actually functioned in a tournament setting. I was a little bit disappointed when some of the initial doubts I had had about this division system were confirmed by what I observed at the tournament. This tournament offered all three divisions in most of the events. However, it puzzled me that, in several instances, there were only seven or eight competitors in a certain division and that the divisions were not collapsed. A few of the events had two sections with four competitors in each section, and some of the smaller ones only had one section, meaning that the students would hear the same speakers in all of their rounds of competition. This paneling seemed problematic to me in the sense that I see the exposure to different speakers and different material as a big part of the educational value of forensics. The divisions appeared to be functioning in such a way as to deny students the possibility of seeing a wider variety of competition. I also had the opportunity to judge several novice and junior rounds of competition, and it struck me that many of the students could have benefited a great deal from seeing some of the more experienced competitors, perhaps even learning more quickly from their exposure to the tougher competition. With the division system in individual events, I feared that the culture was erring on the side of protecting the less experienced students and was thereby missing out on a great opportunity to educate these students by exposing them to a wider variety of competition.

Adjustment Phase

The line between the culture shock phase and the adjustment phase is a fuzzy one at best. I say this because it seems as though during the period of time when I was making the adjustment to the new culture, I had some lapses that felt like a return to the culture shock phase. I suppose that such lapses are completely normal, as human behaviors rarely, if ever, follow the linear path that so many theoretical models prescribe. I do know that my adjustment phase, in the sense of switching from the mindset of "this new culture is so strange" to one of "I need to do more to adapt to this new culture," started late in the fall semester when I hosted a tournament on my campus. I believe that hosting a tournament forced me into the adjustment phase for a couple of reasons. For one, the process of preparing for and hosting a tournament makes one more mindful of the regional community because tournaments are, by and large, a service to the greater community. When one hosts a tournament, all of the work leading up to and during the tournament is done with the ultimate goal of providing a satisfactory tournament experience for all of the coaches and competitors. Second, it is customary at tournaments in the region to invite coaches from other schools to assist in the

tab room, and I had an excellent staff comprised of some of the region's most respected coaches. The assistance of these folks in the tab room and their experience in the regional forensics community were invaluable to me in my attempts to understand and adjust to the new culture.

As I prepared for the tournament, I constantly questioned how much I should play by the rules of the new culture versus sticking with what was familiar to me. Since the tournament is a service to the broader community, I felt a real need to provide the students and judges with a familiar tournament experience. Had I chosen to deviate too far from what was familiar to all of them, I certainly could have alienated myself and made the process of adapting to the new community all the more difficult. To me, then, the adjustment phase was all about deciding where to change my behaviors to accommodate the new culture and where to stay true to my own philosophy as a forensics educator.

One place where I did decide to stand my ground was on the issue of coaching during prep time for parliamentary debate. I specifically stated in the rules for debate on the tournament invitation that coaching was not permitted. This rule was reiterated at the beginning of the tournament when the coach who was running my debate tab, an established member of the community, politely reminded coaches and competitors of this rule by making an announcement about it to the group. I received no complaints about this rule during the tournament, and a few coaches even came up and thanked me for implementing this rule.

Perhaps the most difficult decision I faced during the tournament had to do with a situation involving the cultural rules about posting the lists of finalists in individual events. I was accustomed to only doing postings after all of the preliminary rounds of IE and debate were finished, but, as I mentioned previously, at some tournaments earlier in the semester I noticed that postings went up the night before. On the Saturday of our tournament, the third and final preliminary round of pattern "A" of individual events was finished. I announced that finals would not be posted until Sunday morning after the completion of the "B" pattern, which was scheduled for early in the morning. I soon got word from the members of my tab staff that at least one coach was extremely upset by my decision not to post the "A" pattern finals. This coach had students who were only entered in the "A" pattern, and they did not want to drive back to campus tomorrow if they would not be participating in the final round. This particular school was close enough to my campus that they were commuting from home each day as opposed to spending the night at an area hotel. This decision was terribly difficult for me because I had a strong belief that postings for final rounds should only occur in the hours leading up to the finals. I also had great difficulty with the idea of posting finalists in some events when the preliminary rounds of IE competition were yet to be completed. However, the coach who was upset was one of the most established members of the community, an individual who had been coaching forensics in the region for some 20 years. At some point, I realized that while posting in the evening was a foreign concept to me, it was something that was an accepted cultural practice in the region. While it went against many of my own personal philosophies about coaching and competition, I ultimately

decided to put the beliefs of the larger community over my own and post the results that evening.

The process of serving as tournament host was a valuable catalyst in my adjustment to the new culture. It forced me to weigh my needs and interests as a forensics educator against the needs and interests of the broader community. Hosting a tournament is inevitably a stressful event, but this stress is compounded when the host is not yet familiar with all of the cultural rules. Obviously, my understanding of the rules of my new regional forensics culture was incomplete at that point, but as a host I had to carefully consider what I knew so far of my new culture and adapt accordingly. This process of adaptation created a shift in my perspective whereby I focused more on my own inability to change as opposed to the "problems" I perceived in my new culture. Instead of blaming my new culture, I started to examine my own habits and practices more critically.

The adjustment phase started at the tournament I hosted, but it certainly did not end there; instead, this phase continued throughout the year. As my understanding of the new culture increased, I continuously made decisions about where and how to modify my own behaviors to suit the new culture. For instance, I decided that my team would conform to the rules that I was familiar with regarding audience behavior at awards assemblies. My students were encouraged to applaud for their teammates, as long as the applause was polite so as not to appear self-congratulatory. I also decided that, when final rounds were posted late in the evening, I would stick to my own philosophy by having my students wait until the next morning to view the results. The adjustment phase was difficult at times because of the challenge of striking a balance between the familiar and the unfamiliar, but it was a necessary step in my process of understanding and operating within the new culture.

Acculturation Phase

In my particular experience, the acculturation phase was marked by not only knowing the rules of the new culture but also by coming to an understanding of the underlying reasons for these rules. I believe that one can adjust to a new culture by recognizing some of the cultural rules and making certain modifications to one's behavior as a result. However, at the acculturation phase an individual makes decisions about how the new culture changes her or his identity, and such a change requires more than a surface understanding of the cultural rules and practices. With this in mind, I offer a summary of what I have come to understand about my regional microculture and a discussion of how this understanding has impacted my identity.

I am now at the conclusion of my fourth season of coaching in the region, and I believe that my process of acculturation is now complete. Four years might seem like a long time for the process of acculturation, but this length of time is deceiving when one considers the fact that the forensics culture is a weekend culture. Since I am only exposed to my regional forensics community on weekends from September through March, my exposure to and understanding of the culture

is certainly not comprised of a full four years' worth of cultural immersion. However, after completing four seasons, I feel like an established member of the regional forensics community. The fact that the broader cultural framework of college life is itself on a four-year cycle certainly contributes to my feeling that the acculturation process is complete. The relationships I have developed during my time in the region have also solidified my feelings of acceptance in the community. An entire generation of students in the region are now familiar with me as a judge and tournament host, and I have also had the opportunity to develop friendships with coaches in the region.

Probably the most significant understanding I have reached regarding the culture of my new region has to do with the chromatics, or the value that is placed on time, of the culture. Most of the tournaments in the region offer both parliamentary debate and individual events; as a result, many of the tournaments are on three-day schedules to allow time for all of these events. Individual events are rarely scheduled at the same time as parliamentary debate because students are encouraged to participate in both debate and individual events. Between six preliminary rounds of debate and three preliminary rounds of individual events, a three-day schedule is required unless one wants to schedule rounds of competition late in the evening. Compounding the fact that tournaments usually run three days is the fact that many schools in the region have to make long trips to participate in tournaments. When faced with an eight-hour drive after a three-day tournament, one can understand why the efficient use of time is an important priority. Finally, time also comes into play in the sense that coaches have very little if any free time during tournaments due to a limited judging pool. Most coaches judge nearly every round of competition, and for many schools the same coach travels to almost every tournament.

When I examine some of the cultural differences via the chromatics of the culture, a few of the behaviors and practices that were once disorienting and confusing begin to make more sense. The posting of final round participants in the evening is likely an outgrowth of the three-day tournaments. With homework and other commitments, students who are not participating in finals cannot always afford to spend an extra day at the tournament. The time factor also influences tournament dress to some extent, as teams faced with long drives at the conclusion of awards are probably the ones who change into the more casual dress prior to awards to save the valuable time after awards for travel. Finally, the cultural rules about time are also part of the rationale behind holding the semi-finals and finals of debate after the awards assembly. When a total of four teams are left in the debate tournament, the chromatics of the culture dictates that the time concerns of the many should take precedence over those of the few (in this case, the remaining debate teams). The more I participate in the long weekend tournaments where I am judging most, if not all, of the rounds, the more I am coming to an understanding of the cultural rules about time in the region and how and why these rules influence other cultural practices. I acknowledged the value that the culture places on time, for instance, by holding the debate finals at my tournament after the awards. I made this difficult decision mindful of the fact that

several of the schools in attendance faced long drives after the tournament. There is also the practical consideration for some of facing restrictions on how late their schools will allow them to travel. The motor pool at my institution imposes a 2 a.m. curfew on college vehicles, so I can understand and appreciate the concern with time.

Although I have shifted my perspective to adjust to the way time is valued in my new culture, I have also found places where I have kept parts of my previously established coaching identity. On the surface, this might seem to fly in the face of the theme of adaptation, but it is consistent with the previously discussed "additive" nature of acculturation. For instance, two years ago the coaches in the region approved a new rule that requires that the hosts of our regional tournaments allow for the coaching of parliamentary debate teams during prep time. I have since allowed coaching during prep time at the tournament I host, but I still will not coach my own parliamentary teams. This particular issue of coaching during prep time is one area where I was only able to go so far in adapting to the norms in my new culture. Cultural adaptation is not a process whereby one gives up all aspects of her/his previously established identity, and in this particular instance the values from my own personal coaching philosophy and system of ethics outweighed my need to find acceptance within the new culture.

Conclusions and Implications

I mentioned at the outset that this essay is an attempt to use auto-ethnographic writing as a means to better understand and make sense of my own experiences in making a transition from one forensics culture to another. At the conclusion of this writing process, I find that my understanding has been enhanced in at least two significant ways. For one, I have a better idea of what I will and will not do to adapt my own identity to the rules of the new culture. There are ways in which my personal philosophy of coaching differs from the broader community, and while I can adapt to the regional culture in some ways, I will not completely change my style or approach to suit the new culture. Instead, I am confident that I can hold to some of my fundamental beliefs about forensics while finding ways to make these beliefs work within the framework of the new culture. A second understanding that I have reached through this writing process is a better sense of how to prepare my students for competition in the region. I have a lot of students who are new to intercollegiate forensics this year, and the process of putting some of the cultural differences in writing has given me a deeper understanding of the cultural rules which I can pass on to my students in order to ease their transition into the culture. In addition to the understandings that I achieved through this writing process, some critical conclusions can be drawn about the series of research questions I presented at the outset.

The concept of culture shock is a theoretical construct that can produce worthwhile insights about shifts within microcultural environments. Culture shock can be experienced to varying degrees, and even a small shift like a move from one region to another in the intercollegiate forensics world can produce the

feelings of disorientation, anxiety, and confusion that are common symptoms of culture shock. I am sure that some intercultural communication scholars might quibble with my application of culture shock in this study, but I take a utilitarian view of theory in the sense that theoretical concepts are useful as long they generate new insights about an experience. For me, the concept of culture shock meets and exceeds this utilitarian standard in this inquiry.

Another question I presented at the outset involved understanding whether a coach should embrace the beliefs and practices of the new regional culture or resist change and risk projecting a "go it alone" mentality. While I suspect that the answer to this question would vary somewhat from individual to individual, in examining my process of adaptation I have to say that neither one of the two extremes is desirable. While it would be nice to think that one could simply shift regions and automatically "get" the rules of the new culture, this simply does not happen since the process of culture shock is something that occurs over time. Even if one were to reach a surface understanding of some of the cultural rules right away, the only way to reach a deeper understanding of some of the cultural rules is to live within the culture for some amount of time and engage in critical dialogue (both internal and external) on issues of difference. The chromatics of my new forensics region, for example, is something that I only started to understand and appreciate with the time I have spent immersed in the microculture. Resisting change completely is another way to set oneself up for trouble. In making the transition from one region to another, a "go it alone" mentality is undesirable because so much of your feeling of comfort in the new culture depends on your willingness to understand the rules of the culture, even if you do not completely agree with them. This willingness to understand does not mean that a coach should significantly change her or his pedagogical philosophy, but it does mean that one has to at least be open to the possibility of making such changes if they are warranted.

The last question I presented had to do with the amount of time one should devote to the acculturation process and the issue of what "legitimizes" a newcomer as a member of the community. I discovered in the writing of this essay that the acculturation process in this particular case takes longer than a year. If acculturation means coming to a deep understanding of some of the factors which under gird the cultural rules and practices, then I suspect it takes several years of coaching in a new region before one really starts to understand all of the finer points. "Legitimacy" comes with this understanding as well, since one can only be accepted as a member of the culture when one achieves the deeper level of understanding that the process of acculturation demands. After four years of coaching in my new region, I feel like I have completed the process of acculturation, but I suspect that this time frame would vary greatly from individual to individual. The process of acculturation is valuable because it provides us with a more sophisticated understanding of whom we are and why we behave in certain ways. Samovar and Porter (2004) note that the end result of the process of acculturation for an individual is the "ability to 'live within two' cultures [which] is often accompanied by feelings of enjoyment and satisfaction" (p. 297). The

process of adapting to a new region can be difficult, but ultimately the rewards of personal growth and greater self-awareness far outweigh the costs.

The transitions from one cultural environment to another are an almost constant feature of everyday life. While we might not always think of these transitions in cultural terms, the theoretical lens provided by intercultural communication scholarship, and more specifically concepts related to culture shock, provide valuable tools for understanding and critiquing these daily shifts. There is a tendency to overlook "small" shifts in context, like the transition from coaching forensics in one region to another, because these shifts are not usually as abrupt or striking as other cultural encounters. However, these shifts should not be ignored because they can often create a significant amount of dissonance. As J. M. Bennett (1998) explains, "One of the difficulties in considering culture shock is the tendency to treat it as an exotic ailment with origins rooted in faraway places. In fact, culture shock bears a remarkable resemblance to the tensions and anxieties we face whenever change threatens the stability of our lives" (p. 215). The auto-ethnographic approach I have taken in this essay is one way to take the seemingly mundane experiences from our everyday lives and view them in cultural terms. Writing, in the form of journals, diaries, and travelogues, is often used by visitors to a foreign land to document and understand their experiences. In a similar fashion, the process of writing about one's experience of adapting to another microculture can produce valuable insights and perhaps make us more cognizant of the various "culture shocks" we all experience.

References

- Allen, M, Berkowitz, S., Hunt, S., & Louden, A. (1999). A meta-analysis of the impact of forensics and communication education on critical thinking. *Communication Education, 48*(1), 18-30.
- Andersen, P. A., Lustig, M. W., & Andersen, J. F. (1987). Regional patterns of communication in the United States: A theoretical perspective. *Communication Monographs, 54*, 128-144.
- Antal, D. (1998). A linguistic odyssey: One family's experience with language shift and cultural identity in Germany and France. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 133*, 143-168.
- Baker, D. G. (2001). Future homemakers and feminist awakenings: Autoethnography as a method in theological education and research. *Religious Education, 96*(3), 395-407.
- Barna, L. M. (1976). How culture shock affects communication. *Communication, 5*(1), 1-18.
- Bennett, M. J. (1998). *Intercultural communication: A current perspective*. In M. J. Bennett (Ed.), *Basic concepts of intercultural communication: Selected readings* (pp. 1-34). Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.
- Bennett, J. M. (1998). *Transition shock: Putting culture shock in perspective*. In M. J. Bennett (Ed.), *Basic concepts of intercultural communication: Selected readings* (pp. 215-223). Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.
- Cambra, R. E., & Klopff, D. W. (1978). An exploratory study of contest speaker characteristics. *Speech Education, 6*, 82-92.
- Duncan, M. (2004). Autoethnography: Critical appreciation of an emerging art. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 3*(4), 1-14.
- Ferraro, G. P. (1994). *The cultural dimension of international business* (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
- Jackson, R. L., & Garner, T. (1998). Tracing the evolution of "race," "ethnicity," and "culture" in communication studies. *Howard Journal of Communications, 9*(1), 41-55.
- Kohls, R. L. (1996). *Survival kit for overseas living: For Americans planning to live and work abroad* (3rd ed.). Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.
- Lysgaard, S. (1955). Adjustment in a foreign society: Norwegian Fulbright grantees visiting the United States. *Acta Psychologica, 11*, 189-190.
- MacLennan, J. (2002). There's a lizard in my living room and a pigeon in my classroom: A personal reflection on what it takes to teach in a different culture. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research, 31*(1), 13-28.
- Oberg, K. (1960). Culture shock: Adjustments to new cultural environments. *Practical Anthropology, 4*, 177-182.
- Reed-Danahay, D. (2002). Turning points and textual strategies in ethnographic writing. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 15*(4), 421-425.
- Samovar, L. A., & Porter, R. E. (2004). *Communication between cultures* (5th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Webb, M. W. (1983). Cross-cultural awareness: A framework for interaction. *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 67(8), 498-500.

Zapf, M. K. (1993). Remote practice and culture shock: Social workers moving to isolated northern regions. *Social Work*, 38(6), 694-704.

Analyzing Innovation and Education in Forensics

Elizabeth N. Ribarsky, University of Nebraska-Lincoln

Abstract

While the forensics community appears to support the diversity of ideas and experimentation in public speaking, the community's cultural norms have stifled innovation in forensics. Students who do not use the conventional format for an event are frequently chastised with low scores. To examine the dialectic of innovation and education, the researcher collected survey data during two tournaments from 102 participants currently involved in the forensics community. This paper defines the current role of innovation in forensics and offers suggestions to create an innovation-friendly environment for judges, coaches and competitors.

As early as 1915, the forensics community reported the challenge of the dialectic of values: winning versus education (Wood & Rowland-Morin, 1989). The community must attempt to balance the educational goal of making knowledgeable rhetorical choices versus adhering to accepted winning strategies for each individual event. Unfortunately, education may go by the wayside in lieu of a winning program. Burnett, Brand, and Meister (2003) wrote that "while forensics typically has been promoted as an educational activity...forensics is, in reality, highly competitive" (p. 12). Students may continue to adhere to presentational norms that have been rewarded with high scores without considering other rhetorical choices. These cultural norms of the forensics community have created an academic hegemony, limiting the role of innovation in individual events. Innovation plays a key role in educating competitors about the presentational choices available to them. As education was set forth as the primary goal of forensics, it is essential to examine how the limitation of innovation, an important educational tool, is currently affecting individual events and the forensics community. This paper will address the current role of innovation in forensics and provide steps for encouraging students to actively step outside their cultural communication norms.

Review of Literature

The forensics community must manage the dialectic between winning and education. By understanding these contradictory forces, "we can become more aware of the tensions, understand what each contributes to our capacity to function as competent educators, and reflect more productively on how to talk to each other and our students" (Hinck, 2003, p. 67). Managing these dialectical tensions may prove to be a challenge for some individuals or programs which simply seek to follow a traditional winning format, rather than consider other appropriate presentational choices. Conventional formats, sometimes despairingly referred to as "cookie cutter" approaches (Dean, 1990), encourage the perpetuation of presentational norms. Therefore, innovative and educationally-based performances may

become a rarity. It is imperative to understand how this shift in the dialectic might affect the forensics community. This discussion will address the following: (a) defining the dialectic, (b) perpetuating norms, and (c) narrow judging standards.

Defining the Dialectic

To understand the dialectic at hand, one must first examine the definition of forensics. McBath (1975) argued that "forensics is an educational activity primarily concerned with using an argumentative perspective in examining problems and communicating with people...forensics activities, including debate and individual events, are laboratories for helping students to understand and communicate various forms of argument more effectively in a variety of contexts with a variety of audiences" (p. 11).

Over the decades, the forensics community has not always advanced this vision of education. McBath's vision clearly views forensics as an activity intended to promote creativity and innovation, which teaches students to experiment and furthermore, to communicate more effectively. However, the freedom to experiment with innovative rhetorical choices has been stifled. While some students may attempt to take minor performance risks within event norms to separate themselves from the competition, few students truly seek out innovative performances that challenge the unwritten rules of performance. The forensics community has created a culture of homogeneity, as students are rewarded with high scores for conforming to norms (Bartanen, 1994) while students varying from traditional formulas of success may be given low scores. For example, while Monroe's motivated sequence may be a more appropriate method for one persuasive topic, this format may be given low scores for not fitting the standard problem-cause-solution formula. Students who experiment outside of forensics norms are criticized for taking risks (Dean, 1992). The community has established a complacent mentality: If one method seems to work, that is the only correct method to use. The lack of innovation and experimentation moves the community further away from the educational purpose of forensics.

Furthermore, as the forensics community continues to implement the same presentational formats, the community limits its ability to implement other acceptable presentational formats. Without knowledge of other presentational formats, the community may be moving further away from a realistic style of public speaking. Forensics was intended to prepare students for "real-world" speaking and leadership opportunities (Derryberry, 1991; Madsen, 1990; Stepp, 1997). But, these real-world speaking opportunities have been lost, as narrower expectations have locked students into one style of presenting in order to please a homogenous audience. The student no longer has to attempt to adapt to various audiences because the public has been removed from this public speaking setting. "While the skills forensics teaches are certainly valuable, their direct applicability to parallel contexts outside the tournament setting is more limited than the forensics community would like to admit" (Dean, 1992, p. 192). This lack of realistic presentational styles through norm perpetuation further hinders the educational values.

Perpetuating Norms

To further understand how the community has moved away from the educational end of the winning versus education dialectic, an examination of the perpetuation of norms must be rendered. While the forensics community has thoroughly outlined event standards (Olson, 1989), it is the unwritten rules, or norms, of competition that discourage innovative performances and the conscious making of educationally-based performance choices. Through these norms, students attempt to copy winning performances, rather than thinking about their performance choices. Forensics has become a formula-based competition (Paine, in press). Students may assume that if one performance format wins, that is the only style that will win. Therefore, the community is pushed further toward the winning, rather than the educational, side of the dialectic. To further understand the role norm development plays in the limiting of education in forensics, it is imperative to examine the process of norm development. Cronn-Mills (1997) outlined a twelve-step program of the evolution of an unwritten rule:

1. A talented student tries something new/different;
2. talented student is rewarded by judge for a strong performance (judge may not even have liked the new approach, yet votes for student because overall performance was strong);
3. student continues to win at a variety of tournaments;
4. other students observe the winning student and attribute success to the new/different approach;
5. other students adapt the new approach into their performances;
6. judges see "everyone" doing the new approach and assume this is how it is supposed to be done;
7. judges start expecting everyone to include the new approach;
8. judges start penalizing students who fail to include the new approach;
9. students believe they must include the new approach to be competitive;
10. seniors graduate;
11. forensic alumni return (as either graduate coaches or hired judges) the next season and employ the 'unwritten rules' they learned as competitors in order to render decisions;
12. the unwritten rule is perpetuated by the community until we return to Step One when a talented student tries something new/different.

Through these twelve-steps, norms are perpetuated throughout forensics community. As students follow these unwritten rules, they limit their educational experience, as they are simply following what everyone else is doing. It is only when a student risks his/her scores by swaying from the traditional format that new performance choices are brought into the community. However, these new performance choices will only be made available if the innovative performance is rewarded with high scores (see Step Two). Because students tend to focus on winning performances, they will only examine other performance choices if they

have earned high marks. Unfortunately, once students adopt this new style of performance, innovation and rhetorical choices are once again stifled until another student takes a risk in his/her performance. Students quickly adopt these occasionally bizarre norms with little question, simply with the desire to win and "fit in."

In the pursuit of competitive success, students tend to take the path of least resistance. If a competitor is able to model a "winning" speech, it is assumed that the competitor has what he/she needs to win. In emulating previously successful formulas, students no longer think about the choices made in constructing their performance or event. Consequently, the educational emphasis of forensics is further diluted. The forensics community places too much emphasis on the product rather than the process (Friedley, 1992). Forensics has become an activity of conforming to what is "in" rather than assessing the conceptual and rhetorical choices made in constructing an effective message.

Narrow Judging Standards

However, competitors are not the only individuals limiting their educational experience in forensics. Judges have adopted narrow standards that hinder students from taking rhetorical risks. These narrow judging standards came about, as researchers suggested that perhaps diversity in forensics was undesirable (Mills, 1983). The loose judging standards provided too much flexibility, which could allow students to radically alter the purpose of an event. Furthermore, event flexibility created problems for judges attempting to provide rationally and consistently applied standards of evaluation. Therefore, researchers urged a uniform code for judging (Mills, 1983). The specific standards would potentially provide more accurate and fair judging across the nation from trained and "lay" judges (Olson, 1989; Ross, 1984). Furthermore, forensics alumni that return as judges perpetuate these narrow standards. The alumni use the performance norms they learned as competitors to judge current students (Cronn-Mills, 1997). By using alumni as judges, competitors may never be exposed to judging philosophies outside of the forensics community. Therefore, students are adopting uniform performances to fit uniform judging standards that continue to be instilled by returning alumni. These uniform judging standards created a forensics pedagogy that relies upon a "cookie-cutter" mentality (Dean, 1990). Judges may assume if a performance does not fit a cookie-cut format, it is not a good performance. Though these narrow standards of judging attempted to create fair judging across the community, these standards may have furthered a cultural hegemony that diminishes the motivation for innovation in forensics.

Research Hypotheses and Question

Balancing the dialectic of winning versus education remains a contemporary challenge in the forensics community (Wood & Rowland-Morin, 1989). As students attempt to create a winning performance, they are inherently forced

further away from the educational side of the dialectic. With narrow judging standards in place (Mills, 1983), students attempt to adopt these standards to earn high marks. Students are adopting these formats without consciously considering the rhetorical choices made, thus, limiting education and innovation in forensics. However, we lack the current national data needed to determine innovation's effect on the winning versus education dialectic. Therefore, the researcher poses the following hypotheses:

H1: Event norms are encouraged in forensics.

H2: Event norms stifle innovation in forensics.

Because education is base from which forensics was developed (McBath, 1975), it is imperative to explore how to move the forensics community, once again, toward an educationally-based pedagogy. If there is an attitude that predisposes the community to rely on presentational formulas, we must consider what can be done to encourage innovation. Thus, the researcher poses the following question:

RQ1: How can the community encourage innovation and education in forensics?

Scholarly attention must be directed toward innovation and education in forensics, as there has been a shift in the balance of winning versus education. This shift has limited education, a primary purpose of forensics, and furthered homogenous performances throughout the community. This investigation will provide a better understanding of how to once again create a balance between winning and education.

Methodology

Participants

The study included 102 participants (males = 53, females = 49) currently involved in the forensics community. The participants included 8 hired judges, 30 coaches and 64 competitors. The respondents' years of participating in forensics ranged from 1 to 36 years ($M = 5.84$, $SD = 5.59$).

Procedures

The researcher distributed a total of 300 questionnaires at a moderately-sized tournament at a Midwestern university and at the 2004 NFA national tournament. Though 105 surveys were returned, three questionnaires had to be eliminated because they were incomplete or illegible, leaving 102 usable surveys. Participation in this study was voluntary and anonymous. The researcher informally distributed the questionnaires on an individual basis or provided coaches

surveys at registration to give to their students. To ensure anonymity and ease, the participants were instructed to complete the survey at their convenience and return the survey to a box at a central location during the tournament. The survey took 5 to 15 minutes to complete. Once collected, the researcher removed the informed consent forms from the questionnaires to ensure that a signature could not be linked to a particular questionnaire, further ensuring anonymity.

Questionnaire: Demographics

Part one of the survey identified basic demographic information. This demographic information included: sex, role (hired judge, competitor or coach) and years of participation in forensics. This information allowed the researcher to draw conclusions about the representative qualities of the sample to the general forensics community.

Innovation in Forensics

Because of a lack of measures available regarding innovation and forensics, the researcher developed an original measure based upon previous research. The measure contained 22 items involving six categories of analysis, including the following: encouragement of norms (e.g., "Competitors who fit these norms are rewarded with high scores"), stifling of innovation (e.g., "Competitors who take risks in performances receive low scores"), forensics and education (e.g., "Education is more important than competitors in forensics"), lay judge use (e.g., "Nontraditional judges are better judges of realistic expectations"), experimental events (e.g., "Experimental events would encourage innovation in forensics"), and conferences (e.g., "Innovation in forensics is an important issues that should be examined at future conferences"). Each item contained a 7-point Likert scale, from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (7). The researcher reversed scored designated questions and ran a Cronbach's alpha reliability test for each category of questions (norm encouragement, $\alpha = .72$; stifling of innovation, $\alpha = .74$; forensics and education, $\alpha = .44$; lay judge use, $\alpha = .45$; experimental events, $\alpha = .74$; & conferences, $\alpha = .64$). These low reliability scores may be due to multiple factors, including a tournament setting that encourages winning and time constraints between rounds. Though reliability was low for the first-time use of this questionnaire, this survey provides the groundwork for understanding the role of innovation in forensics and improving future questionnaires.

Results

Hypothesis 1

H1: Event norms are encouraged in forensics.

To determine the extent to which norms, or unwritten rules, are encouraged in forensics, the mean for event norms was calculated ($M = 5.62$, see Table 1).

This mean revealed moderate level of agreement, indicating that conforming to norms is encouraged in forensics. An independent sample *t*-test was used to test the effects of gender on pressure to conform to community norms. The *t*-test did not reveal a significant difference between males and females, $t(100) = -.124$, $p = .90$. Both the males ($M = 5.70$, $SD = 1.41$) and females ($M = 5.73$, $SD = 1.56$) indicated a moderate pressure to conform to norms in forensics.

Hypothesis 2

H2: Event norms stifle innovation in forensics.

The mean was calculated to determine the effects of norms on innovation ($M = 4.61$). This mean indicates a slight level of agreement that community norms stifle innovation in forensics. Furthermore, the mean was calculated to examine the importance of education versus competition in forensics ($M = 4.68$). This indicated a slight level of agreement that education and innovation should play a more important role than competition in forensics. A *t*-test was calculated to determine if gender influences the perception of innovation and education being more important than competition in forensics. A significant difference between males and females regarding importance of education did not exist, $t(100) = -1.04$, $p = .30$. Both males ($M = 5.11$, $SD = 1.86$) and females ($M = 5.47$, $SD = 1.58$) designated a moderate level of agreement that education plays a more important role than competition in forensics.

Table 1

Items	Mean
Event norms are encouraged.	5.62
Event norms stifle innovation.	4.61
Not adapting to event norms results in low scores.	5.30
Education is more important than competition.	4.68
Lay judges could encourage realistic performances.	3.87
Experimental events could encourage education and innovation.	5.22
Future conferences should examine innovation.	4.48

Research Question 1

RQ1: How can the community encourage innovation and education in forensics?

To determine ways in which the forensics community can encourage innovation and education in forensics, the researcher calculated the means for each category of change: lay judges encourage realistic performances ($M = 3.87$), experimental events would improve education and innovation ($M = 5.22$), and

conferences could urge future discussion regarding innovation and forensics ($M = 4.48$). These means indicate a slight level of agreement that experimental events and conferences regarding innovation in forensics would encourage education and innovation in forensics. However, only a neutral stance regarding lay judges as a tool for increasing educational opportunities was revealed. An independent sample t -test was used to determine if gender has an effect on the acceptance of lay judges as judges of realistic performance expectations. No significant difference was found, $t(100) = -.92, p = .36$. Males ($M = 3.41, SD = 1.47$) and females ($M = 3.70, SD = 1.56$) were neutral or slightly disagreed that nontraditional judges could expose competitors to realistic listener expectations, thus, encouraging educational rhetorical choices.

Discussion

This study attempted to provide current data regarding the state of innovation and education in forensics. The findings indicate that education and innovation are important issues to the forensics community; however, education through the use of innovative rhetorical choices may be stifled due to the perpetuation of event norms. Individuals may fear if they sway from event norms, they will be chastised with low scores ($M = 5.30$). Diminishing this fear and bringing the community back to its educationally-based roots is imperative. To bring innovation and education back to forensics, the following will introduce specific steps that can be taken to ameliorate the current state of forensics, including: (a) reintroducing the public back into forensics, (b) altering events, and (c) leading change.

Reintroducing the Public

As forensics has advanced, a larger gap between the speaker and the audience has appeared. With a single standard way of performing an event, the student has lost the educational value of learning to adapt to various audiences, hence, making forensics incredibly unrealistic. The reintroduction of the public through the use of nontraditional judges, better known to the forensics community as "lay judges", could bring forth a wider range of listener expectations, thus, urging students to implement different rhetorical choices. While participants indicated a sense of neutrality regarding the use of nontraditional judges, it is important to examine the effects lay judges could have on the activity. Reintroducing the public to forensics could have dramatic positive effects.

First, the use of nontraditional judges exposes competitors to a diversified panel of listener and judge expectations (Bartanen, 1994). By encouraging a judging pool that is not socialized into the forensics norms and expectations, students must learn to adapt to various audiences. Advocating audience analysis would create a more realistic style of speaking and a higher level of learning (Derryberry, 1991). Classical scholars argued that the most important aspect of public speaking is understanding and adapting to your audience (Dean, 1992).

Second, a panel of lay judges could prove to be better judges of performance. Judges who are or were involved with forensics are socialized into a thinking pattern of what is "successful" and what is not. These experienced judges are less likely to be accepting of innovation. Nontraditional judges are more apt to accurately judge when a performance truly moves them (Dean, 1992), rather than concentrating on norm violations.

Finally, bringing the public back into the public speaking contest would promote better public visibility and backing for the activity (Bartanen, 1994). With prominent community members serving as lay judges, forensics quickly could be brought into the public eye. Bartanen (1994) noted external support is one of the easiest ways a program can protect itself from budget cuts.

Of course, the use of nontraditional judges raises several critical issues, which all point to whether we should view forensics as an educational or competitive situation (Bartanen, 1994). Thus far, concentrating on competition has promoted homogeneity. While competition may play a role as a motivating factor, it is imperative to acknowledge some of the educational qualities have been lost in the midst of competition. By including nontraditional judges in the judging pool, students would be forced to examine multiple methods of presentation, furthering the adoption of a more realistic style of speaking. While nontraditional judges may turn to experienced judges for advice, these lay judges still will bring new experiences and expectations to rounds. Students may feel free to adopt innovative performances if they believe that not every judge will be looking for the traditional presentational format. Furthermore, students may become accustomed to adaptation to judges and incorporating innovative techniques with the implementation of altered event standards.

Altering Standards

Ragan (2000) argued that the communication discipline continues to attempt to measure the quality of a product through the use of a "standard social science yardstick" (p. 233). While this yardstick provides a sense of a uniform method of comparison, it provides an unrealistic measurement standard. Using a social science yardstick is like attempting to measure beauty with a ruler. It is significant challenge to measure a subjective issue. A similar problem is evident in the forensics community. Currently, a performance is not necessarily judged upon its quality. Rather, a performance may be judged by how well it fits into an established mold. The quality and beauty of a performance should be in the opinion of the listener, not in how well it fits into a mold.

While it would be simple to ask judges to remove their biases, this is an unrealistic request. One method of encouraging the incorporation of innovation is an alteration of event standards. The same event could have different standards at various tournaments or during various years. For example, a tournament could encourage participation in an experimental event, such as impromptu duo or forensics criticism. Forensics criticism is described as "an original speech designed to encourage forensic competitors to evaluate the current state of

forensics competition" (Frank, Mohn, & Ford, 2002, p. 1). Contestants can use this forum to advocate change in some element of forensic competition. The University of Oregon recently implemented this event with rave reviews from competitors. These experimental events could challenge students to step out of their comfort zones. This challenge encourages opportunities to learn new presentation styles without being chastised for violating forensics norms.

On a national level, event standards could be altered from year to year. It is currently an unwritten rule that informative speeches must address a new technology. The national tournament could alter standards to state that informative speeches must be biographical one year and technologically-based the next. Ziegelmueller (1980) suggested that the incorporation of a wider variety of activities could provide more opportunities for participation.

While variance in event standards could create tournament inefficiency by challenging judges to evaluate unfamiliar performances, event alteration could reap two significant benefits. First, altering an event's structure would expose judges to various formats of competition. By seeing that a different format than the culture's norm can be successful, judges are more likely to respond better to innovation and not chastise students for their creativity. Second, encouraging students to use multiple formats would increase the educational value of forensics. Competitors are able to strengthen their presentation with multifaceted performance styles (Derryberry, 1991). Competitors would be forced to learn a more extensive array of presentation styles, therefore, making students note the strengths and weaknesses of various formats and how to adapt these styles to the audience.

Community Action

An educational and competitive balance is only possible through the application of continuous improvement. "Continuous improvement is about empowerment, synergy, encouragement, and the ability and willingness to create an environment where every one... can participate in the learning process. However, continuous improvement can only take place where everyone concerned with the process is willing to commit to the participation in the process" (Richardson & Lane, 1997, p. 58). Though cooperative action may take time and significant effort on behalf of competitors, coaches, and judges, it will increase the rate of implementation and acceptance of positive changes in forensics.

Action to combat the negative effects of cultural norms can occur in two forums: tournaments and conferences. First, we can take advantage of tournament gatherings to consider issues regarding innovation and event standards. In the time between the last final round and awards, competitors, judges and coaches could participate in a collaborative discussion that may generate new ideas. This tournament downtime could be used constructively while not altering the typical tournament schedule.

Second, we need to continue to address the issue of innovation and forensics at future conferences. Forensics issues need addressing in a large and

representative forum (Murphy, 1984) to promote a diversity of ideas. Conferences provide a sufficient forum and ample possibilities for deliberation (Zarefsky & Sillars, 2000). Future roundtable discussions would allow reflection on innovation outside of the tournament atmosphere.

This transition will require innovative and powerful leaders to start the movement towards an innovative forensics community. While the forensics community has trained a plethora of winners, finding true leaders is much more difficult. Leaders bring about significant change (Kotter, 1996); however, until now, few participants have been willing to step outside of cultural norms. These leaders must emerge on all levels: competitors, coaches, and judges. As Senge (1990) noted, leaders "instill confidence in those around them that, together, 'we can learn whatever we need to learn in order to achieve the results we truly desire'" (p. 359). If the forensics community is able to join together in a cooperative movement to bring education and innovation back to forensics, the community will benefit from the original purpose of forensics - developing skilled and adaptive speakers.

Limitations and Future Research

While this study provides insight into an understudied realm of forensics, it is not without limitations. First, the convenience sample was smaller than the researcher desired. Only 102 useable surveys were rendered. This small participant pool limits the generalizability of the findings. Second, the questionnaire had poor reliability scores. These scores hinder the strength of the findings, as the results may have not been consistent.

However, limitations leave room for improvement and future study. First, this investigation should be replicated with a larger participant pool. A larger pool would enable the results to be generalized more effectively to the forensics community. Second, the questionnaire developed for this study should undergo possible revisions. By changing the order of or rewording the items, a greater reliability may be obtained. Furthermore, future study should concentrate on any of the individual areas of innovation to validate their applicability. Through these areas of investigation, the community could benefit from a better understanding of the role of innovation and education in forensics.

Conclusion

While education versus winning has been an ongoing dialectic in the forensics community, it is not a hopeless situation. There are several courses of action we can take to create an education-based environment for students, coaches and judges. However, success of this program exists solely in community's commitment to action and change. By challenging students on all levels of competition to adopt innovative performances, they are forced to consciously consider their rhetorical choices - bringing education and innovation back to forensics.

References

- Bartanen, M. (1994). The case for using nontraditional judges in forensic contests. *Argumentation and Advocacy*, 29, 248-254.
- Burnett, A., Brand, J., & Meister, M. (2003). Winning is everything: Education as a myth in forensics. *National Forensic Journal*, 21, 12-23.
- Cronn-Mills, D. (1997). The "unwritten rules" in oral interpretation: An assessment of current practices. *Speaker Points*, 4. Retrieved October 21, 2002, from <http://www.phirhopi.org/prp/spkrpts4.2/cmills.html>
- Dean, K. W. (1990). Encouraging forensics pedagogy. *National Forensic Journal*, 8, 29-36.
- Dean, K. W. (1992). Putting public back into speaking: A challenge for forensics. *Argumentation and Advocacy*, 28, 192-199.
- Derryberry, B. R. (1991). The nature of the "total" forensic program: The 1990s and beyond. *National Forensic Journal*, 9, 19-29.
- Frank, D., Mohn, P., & Ford, H. (2002). *University of Oregon forensics tournament*. Retrieved November 15, 2002, from University of Oregon Program of Debate and Public Discourse Web site: <http://www.uoregon.edu/~forensic/fall.html>
- Friedley, S. A. (1992). Forensics as a laboratory experience in interpersonal communication. *National Forensic Journal*, 10, 51-56.
- Hinck, E. (2003). Managing the dialectical tension between competition and education in forensics: A response to Burnett, Brand & Meister. *National Forensic Journal*, 21, 60-76.
- Kotter, J. (1996). *Leading Change* (1st ed.). Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Madsen, A. (1990). Graduate students and forensic research. *National Forensic Journal*, 8, 45-49.
- McBath, J. (Ed.). (1975). *Forensics as Communication*. Skokie, IL: National Textbook Co.
- Mills, N. (1983). Judging standards in forensics: Toward a uniform code in the 80's. *National Forensic Journal*, 1, 19-31.
- Murphy, J. (1984). Individual events. In D. Parson (Ed.). *American Forensics in Perspective* (pp. 87-93). Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association.
- Olson, C. D. (1989). The development of evaluation criteria for individual events. In B. Gronbeck's (Ed.). *Spheres of Argument* (pp. 434-439). Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association.
- Paine, R. E. (in press). Identifying and evaluating the "unwritten rules" of competition. *The National Forensic Journal*.
- Ragan, S. (2000). "The critical life": An exercise in applying inapplicable critical standards. *Communication Education*, 49, 229-232.
- Richardson, M., & Lane, K. (1997). Learning as continuous improvement in educational organizations. In M. Richardson, R. Blackbourn, C. Ruhl-Smith, & J. Haynes (Eds.), *The Pursuit of Continuous Improvement in*

Educational Organizations (pp. 55-73). Lanham: University Press of American, Inc.

Ross, D. (1984). Improving judging skills through the judge workshop. *National Forensic Journal*, 2, 33-40.

Senge, P. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization*. New York, NY: Doubleday.

Stepp, P. (1997). Can we make intercollegiate debate more diverse? *Argumentation and Advocacy*, 33, 176-190.

Wood, S., & Rowland-Morin, P. (1989). Motivational tension: Winning vs. pedagogy in academic debate. *National Forensic Journal*, 7, 81-97.

Zarefsky, D., & Sillars, M. O. (2000). AFA support for research: Journals and conferences. *Argumentation and Advocacy*, 37, 48-59.

Ziegelmüller, G. W. (1980). National Developmental Conference on Forensics: An analysis of four basic themes. In J. Rhodes & S. Newell (Eds). *Proceedings of the Summer Conference on Argumentation* (pp. 239-244). Alta, UT: Speech Communication Association.

Home Sweet Home:
The Role of the Forensics Squadroom in Team
Socialization and Identification

Heather J. Carmack, Ohio University

Todd T. Holm, Concordia College

Webmaster's note: There is a corrected bibliographic reference from the printed text: The correct title for Kenneth Burke's book is *Dramatism and Development*.

Abstract

While many aspects of competitive speech and debate programs have been researched and discussed in academic journals, one vital component of forensics has been left untouched by scholarly inquiry: the role of the forensics squadroom. With shrinking budgets and expanding faculty bodies, it is important to be able to show administrators that the space allocated for the forensic squadroom is more than a space to house trophies, but rather is a space for students to socialize and identify with the team. Using both qualitative and quantitative research methods, this article examines the important rhetorical role the squadroom plays as symbol of support for the program, as well as the pragmatic role the squadroom plays in teambuilding and socialization.

Politicians from John F. Kennedy to George McGovern, entertainers from Jim and John Belushi to Arsenio Hall, and television news broadcasters like Jane Pauley (Winebrenner, 1997) have identified their participation in forensics activities as one of the most important experiences leading toward their success. Engleberg (1993) says that forensics "is the single most valuable educational experience you can offer a student" (p. 399). Such endorsements clearly show that forensics has its ideological place in education, but it also needs a physical place on campus. The purpose of this investigation is to explore the value of the forensics squadroom and the role the squadroom plays in a forensics program.

Bullis (1993) explains that most socialization research is "deeply rooted in uncertainty reduction and information processing theories" (p. 15), however communication research has yet to explore how space is involved in negotiating uncertainty and information seeking. Space is part of the overall process, but space has never been divorced from this overall process and studied separately to determine its effect. While a plethora of research explores socialization, no research on the importance of space in the socialization process has been conducted. Several studies have explored socialization that takes place in unique spaces, such as performing arts school or of cruise ships (Cawyer & Friedrich, 1998; Gibson & Papa, 2000; Harter & Kirby, in press; Oseroff-Varnell, 1998; Souza, 1999), but the emphasis is not on the role the physical space plays in the socialization; these articles simply explore the socialization in these places. The research on space does not specifically suggest that space is a factor in the socialization process, but is merely a space for the socialization to occur. However, we argue that the squadroom is more than mere

space for the team to gather and that the space is actually a factor in the socialization process.

While the role of space in the socialization process has been neglected in socialization research, the importance of space has not been completely overlooked. Space, and having space, serves as a symbol of identification. Moran, Skeggs, Tyrer, and Corteen (2001) explain, "The production of space depends on decisions made about what should be visible and what should not, who should occupy the space and who should not" (p. 409). The occupation of space is generally a power struggle over keeping certain parties out. However, the hidden argument in this power struggle is that space means something. Creating and maintaining a space, "is a deliberate means of representing a place and the people who live in it" (Mattingly, 2001, p. 448). In a forensics context, having a space for the team is more than just a practical matter of storage and practice issues. An institution setting aside space for the forensics team is symbolically saying that the program is important and worthy of resources. While an institution that does not provide space for a forensics program is not inherently denying the importance of the program, the institution is saying that other uses of space are more important.

A squadroom may not seem like an area worthy of study to a person who has not worked with forensics activities. That perception is part of the reason this study is important. Thirty years ago, Taylor (1975) noted that it was becoming more difficult to justify the expenditures and commitments of a school to a forensics program. As an institution grows and adds to the number of faculty, available office space becomes a precious commodity. A squadroom could easily be visualized as potential office space for faculty members who are forced to share office space. But the squadroom is critical to the development and maintenance of a successful forensics program.

From a functional perspective, the activities that take place in a squadroom (coaching, practices, research, homework, communication, administrative functions and even socializing) are very important. However, the most important issue may be the role the squadroom plays in team building, specifically in the socialization of new members and fostering program identification. We need to understand what takes place in the squadroom as well as what function the squadroom serves in the development of a team. This article explores the role of the squadroom in forensics programs by examining current socialization and identification research, and using the research to guide how we approach and present the research findings on the importance of space. Finally, we suggest ways this research can begin to explore the role space plays in forensics programs as well as ways to understand what space means to organizational culture.

Socialization and Identification

Organizational communication scholars, looking at small groups within organizations such as task forces, teams, or committees, have noted that the

members of effective groups identify with that group (Cheney, 1983). Members of a group need to not only identify with group members, but identify with group norms, beliefs, and values. Group members are socialized into the group to help with the identification process. How a group goes about socializing and helping members identify with the group is part of the organization's culture. Gibson and Papa (2000) define organizational culture as, "the practices, values, metaphors, stories, vocabulary, ceremonials, rites, heroes, and legends that are held by a group of people" (p. 70). An essential element of organizational culture is the socialization and assimilation of new members. During socialization, new members are introduced to, and become familiar with, the organization's culture. Researchers have focused on the identification process and found that it occurs in both formal and informal settings during the organizational socialization process (VanMaanen, 1973; Feldman, 1981; Duncan, 1985; Kelly, 1985; Miller & Jablin, 1991; and Saks, 1997). The forensics squadroom provides an ideal opportunity for socialization of new members and identification with the program and the activity in an informal setting.

Socialization

Socialization goes far beyond mere socializing. Cawyer and Friedrich (1998) explain that socialization, or "the process by which a person learns the values, norms, and required behaviors which permit him (sic) to participate as a member of the organization," is an ongoing information exchange process that brings the realities of organizational life to light (p. 234). The emphasis is on how messages are communicated and how those messages affect new members' perceptions of the organization. While not clearly stated, the ability to have a space for this socialization to occur plays a role in how organizational messages are received and interpreted. Feldman (1981) identifies three distinct occurrences during the socialization process: 1) members acquire a set of role behaviors; 2) members develop work skills and abilities needed for involvement in the group; and 3) members adjust to the group's norms and values. As we relate these ideas to a forensics team we see that during the socialization process students might 1) come to understand the written and unwritten rules of the activity, 2) learn how to research or cut literature, and 3) make the switch from high school forensics styles to collegiate styles or internalize the standards of excellence expected by the team.

VanMaanen (1975) identifies the stage in which these occurrences take place as the encounter phase. It is important to understand each of these occurrences in the context of a forensics program. Socialization in the forensics program is particularly important because the membership is ever changing. Every four years there is a complete turn over in the competitive body. Ideally, each year 25% of the membership is new and needs to be socialized into the existing group. This constant flux keeps the socialization process at the forefront of group interaction.

Behavioral roles

Acquiring a set of behavioral roles from a team that operates in two distinctly different arenas of interaction (at tournaments and away from tournaments) can further complicate the socialization process because separate roles are played in each environment. Both sets of behavioral roles must be learned for a member to be successfully socialized into the group. Tournament behavioral roles are probably easier to acquire simply because they are more evident and sometimes are spelled out in writing in a team handbook. Hindman, Shackelford, and Schlottach (1993) have listed a few of the behavioral norms associated with tournaments that include professionalism, punctuality, maturity, preparation, and mutual respect. They also identify several logistical norms such as how to "sign in" for events, appropriateness of discussions with judges, attire, and behavior at award ceremonies.

Behavioral expectations away from tournaments are not explicitly stated. They must be learned by observation and sometimes by violation. Since the roles students play while at tournaments may be considerably different than the role they play away from tournaments learning those seemingly conflicting roles can be confusing. The same young woman who stands in front of a room of 80-100 fellow competitors and interprets poetry about the loss of a family farm that brings tears to the eyes of the audience can have a mouth like an Oklahoma truck driver away from the tournament. The young man with body piercing and torn clothing on campus undergoes a metamorphosis into a young professional in a sharp double-breasted suit and providing insight into the conflict in the Middle East. Whatever varying roles the team members play, it is important that they learn the rules, norms, and expectations of the team both at tournaments and away from tournaments. For that to happen, the team members need time together in an unstructured environment. While the squadroom is not the place for the socialization of behavioral roles, it provides a space to ensure the socialization occurs.

Members also learn that forensics is not an easy activity in which to be involved. They learn about practice schedules, the amount of practice "required" who to go to for coaching in which events, and which events to compete in, through their interactions with coaches and varsity competitors. Sometimes these role behaviors are consciously communicated to the new members with the expressed intent of getting them to conform. Other times, the students are simply engaged in storytelling that happens to contain role behavior messages. Saks (1997) discusses how organizations use a sense of history to socialize new members and suggests that making sense of the past can provide a solid foundation for the future of an organization.

Development of skills and abilities

As members enter a new workplace they need to learn how to do their respective jobs. Even if an employee has been making widgets for 20 years at Company ABC, when he or she takes a widget making job at Company XYZ he

or she will have to learn the XYZ method of widget making. Part of socialization includes that learning process.

As students enter collegiate forensics, some come in with high school forensics experience. They have already learned most of the role behaviors. However, collegiate forensics and high school forensics are about as different as high school and college football. They operate on the same playing field with the same equipment but that is about it. While coaching sessions are specifically designed to help students develop skills, they are only a part of the skills development process. As students discuss performances they have seen by competitors from other schools and ideas about how to change their own performances they are not only developing their own skills but also increasing the awareness of the people with whom they discuss these issues. Students learn research skills, speech composition skills, literary analysis, and topic selection criteria from each other in squadrooms. These discussions are not intended to be training or socialization sessions but rather emerge as such from everyday discussions. Those everyday discussions form the backbone of the socialization process.

Adjusting to group norms

Norms are informal rules that identify "the boundaries of acceptable group behavior" (Kreps, 1991, p. 170), with two sets of norms emerging. As Eisenberg & Goodall (1997) point out, it is not uncommon for group norms to be influenced and shaped by national and organizational cultures. In forensics, national organizations (e.g. the American Forensics Association, the National Forensics Association, the National Parliamentary Debate Association, the Cross Examination Debate Association, etc.) and honorary fraternal organizations (e.g. Pi Kappa Delta, Phi Rho Pi, and Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha) can influence local programs to a lesser or greater extent as a result of participation requirements. For example, at the AFA organizational meeting of the 2004 National Communication Association Convention in Chicago, members voted to cap the number of entries to 66 slots per school, a number that could change how schools with large entries decide which team members go to the national tournament. Regional norms also influence individual program norms. For example, American Forensics Association (A.F.A.) District Four has long held to traditions of not competing with events that have qualified for the national tournament and host schools not participating in their own tournaments. A.F.A. District Seven does not hold these same norms.

These norms of competitive participation are usually learned from coaches and teammates in informal settings. The team focus is also learned in informal situations. Some teams are very focused on competition and send messages that if you are not winning you should probably stop wasting team money and quit. Other teams are focused more on the educational aspects of the activity sending messages that it does not matter how you do in competition as long as you are learning and improving (although ideally if you are learning eventually you should probably be winning). Still other programs are focused on participation as

a social activity or a good time. Success is not as important as having fun. Very few programs will spell out their philosophy in writing and those that do have some kind of mission statement of guiding principles in writing usually have a rather vague document that allows for change as the nature and composite of the team membership changes. So an informal method of norm transmission must be in place. The forensics squadroom plays a role in the transmission and development of roles, skills and norms. It serves as a communication hub for the team. The socializing that goes on in the squadroom is intrinsically linked to the socialization process.

Identification

Identification is the extent to which members self-align, associate, or affiliate themselves with the group (Cheney, 1983). A few years ago, forensics was compared to a cult in terms of students' and coaches' commitment to and identification with the activity by several scholars at the National Communication Association Convention (Edelmayer, 1998; Hefling, 1998; Holm, 1998; Kimble, 1998;). This panel focused on forensics as a cult because cults traditionally have extremely strong member identification. The panel decided that while forensics participants met many of the criteria for being a cult, the activity did fall short of cult status in the final analysis because none of the membership claimed to be speaking for God. It should be noted that was the only criteria the members did not meet.

Identification, as explained by Cheney (1983), occurs through one of, a combination of, or all three of the following strategies: 1) Common ground technique, 2) identification through antithesis, and/or 3) the transcendent we. The squadroom can provide a forum for interactions that lead to each of these stages.

Common ground

Common ground technique refers to the process by which members of the group find items or issues they have in common with the new members and place emphasis on those items or issues for the purpose of building alliances and a sense of belongingness. One of the basic tenants of interpersonal communication is that we are attracted to people we perceive to be similar to us (Adler & Towne, 1996). The same is true of attraction to a group. We are more likely to affiliate with a group we perceive as having similar interests or beliefs.

Identification through antithesis

Cheney (1983) explains that identification through antithesis is "the act of uniting against a common 'enemy'" (p. 148). The "enemy," Burke (1972) explains, can refer to any outsider. There is no need for expressed acts of war or hostility. The important factor is that the outsider be identifiable and, in some way, against the organization. In competitive activities it is easy to identify a

common enemy; usually the enemy is the person or group against whom the group competes. They are vilified by accusations of unethical behaviors (coaches writing speeches for students, students making up sources, etc.) or somehow possessing some unfair advantage (a huge budget, tens of thousands of dollars in scholarship money, etc.). The group identifies what "we" are by identifying the negative aspects of others as what we are not. This assignment of blame is sometimes referred to as definition through negation.

Transcendent "we"

The rhetorical concept of transcendent we refer to the use of the pronoun "we" in statements that express the sharing of interests or values by the organization and its members. For example, a group member might say, "That's not how we do it." One person would be speaking for the entire group. Sometimes group norms are conveyed in this manner. A varsity member might tell a new member "We don't change our clothes before the awards ceremony."

If socialization and identification successfully occur, the result is a group that has a shared understanding of its purpose, goals, and direction. The group is made up of individuals that feel part of their identity is being a member of that group. In essence, the activities of the group are not just what the members do; it is part of who the members are as individuals. Socialization is a voluntary process. Indoctrination has connotations of a forced socialization process. Socialization is a far more effective method of team building than indoctrination because the membership, identification, association, and compliance are voluntary rather than compulsory so there is less likelihood that members will resist or revolt. The members choose to become part of the team and choose to associate part of their own identity with being a member of the team.

Methodology

The sample was composed of the top ten schools in each of the National Forensics Association National Tournament sweepstakes divisions in 2001, the American Forensics Association National Individual Events Tournament Champions in 2001, the National Parliamentary Debate Association national sweepstakes winners, and an interval sampling of every third Director of Forensics (DOF) listed in the A.F.A. directory. This yielded a pool of 57 programs surveyed. Approximately 11 forensics programs responded (20%). The survey conducted was a web-based survey form (see Appendix A). The links to the different forms were sent to the programs D.O.F. and they were asked to forward the request and links to their students. A total of 17 coaches and 73 students responded. The number of survey responses by programs was fairly equal ($M = 5.34$) with only two schools sending in over 10 surveys. The two programs that sent in over 10 surveys made up 38.4 % of the variance (15.1 % and 23.3 % respectively). Of the 11 programs, there was an equal distribution in terms of placement at national tournaments, with six programs receiving sweepstakes

awards at 2001 national championship tournaments and five programs not receiving sweepstakes awards at national championship tournaments. Of the two programs that sent in over 10 surveys, only one program received a sweepstakes award in a 2001 national tournament.

The questionnaires asked about more than just what was done in the squadroom. Coaches received open-ended questionnaires, asking about the furnishings and equipment in the squadroom (see Appendix B). Students were asked about demographic information and in which aspects of forensics competition they were involved. Questions about numbers of hours of coaching and relationships with others on the team were also explored. Finally, questions were asked about how important students felt the squadroom was to the team's competitive success. Qualitative interviews were also conducted on individual team participants. These interviews were conducted as a separate project regarding space and the squadroom by the second author (Appendix C). The interview protocol consisted of seven open-ended questions, with varying presentation of questions to prevent a fatigue effect. Themes were extracted from participants' responses.

Results

After 73 student participants completed the study, the items of the study were analyzed through correlations. Of the 73 students surveyed, 69 students replied yes to having a squadroom in some form, three responded no to having a squadroom, and one did not respond. Data was collected to assess possible relationships between the presence of a squadroom and the feeling of success. Students were also asked which they would choose if forced to pick between having a squadroom and going to a national tournament, and whether students would choose to have a squadroom or to win a national championship.

Only one significant correlation was present. There was a positive correlation between the presence of a squadroom and feelings of success ($r = .466$, $p < .05$). This correlation suggests that students' perceived feelings of success hinge on the ability to have a place for the team to reside. There were no significant relationships between the presences of a squadroom and whether students would choose to have squadroom or go to a national tournament and the presence of a squadroom and whether students would chose to have a squadroom or win a national championship. Students and coaches alike recognize and appreciate the role the squadroom plays. On the survey, students were asked if they had to choose (because of budget reasons or for other administrative reasons) between attending a national tournament and having a squadroom and between winning a national championship and having a squadroom which they would chose. Seventy-three participants responded to the item asking about the choice between having a squadroom and attending a national tournament. Twenty-six percent of students said that the squadroom was more important than nationals ($n = 19$), while 74 % said that they would choose attending a national tournament ($n = 54$). A similar result was found when examining the item about having a squadroom and winning a national title. Of the 73 participants that responded to this item, 13.

7 % said having a squadroom was important (n = 10) and 82.9 % (n = 63) chose winning a national championship. However, some participants recognize that their success is connected to having a squadroom, indicated by the positive correlation found earlier between the presence of a squadroom and feelings of success (see Table 1). One student aptly noted, "Luckily, I don't have to choose between a squadroom and nationals."

From the open-ended questions, several themes emerged regarding the function of the squadroom and the role the squadroom plays in the socialization and identification processes of new members.

Squadroom activities

From a pragmatic standpoint, the squadroom primarily serves two functions. First, it is an area where forensics students can gather and work on forensics activities. Participants were asked what they talked about most often when in the squadroom with 72 participants responding to this item. Forensics was the overwhelming response with over 56.3 % (n=40) of participations saying they most often talked about forensics activities (speeches, etc) and another 12.7% (n=9) saying they most often talked about tournament results (team and individual). Clearly a forensics squadroom is devoted primarily to discussions related to forensics. While these results are probably not surprising to anyone with a forensics background, it does reaffirm that a squadroom is not just a club house for college students. The activities that go on in the squadroom revolve around the activity and thus educate students about the activity. This space gives them the opportunity to explore forensics and keep it in the forefront of their minds.

The second major activity that takes place in the squadroom is interpersonal communication. This would include day-to-day mundane conversations as well as discussion about forensics as an activity, goals, interpersonal relationships, and similar discussions. Weick (1987) points out how critical it is for members of a group to have the opportunity to interact on this level: "Interpersonal communication is the essence of organization because it creates structures that then affect what else gets said and done and by whom" (p. 97). Weick describing interpersonal communication as the essence of the organization allows him to make a solid argument for the need for an environment where group members can interact with other group members on a personal level. The space of the forensics squadroom provides a place for the organizational structures needed to develop a team dynamic. While an overwhelming number of responses by the 72 participants said that forensics, either forensics activities or tournaments, was the topic of conversation in the squadroom (64.4 %), 12.7 % indicated that discussions revolved around classes (n=9), 9.9 % said they gossiped (n=8), and 8.5 % responded by talking about romantic and platonic relationships (n=6).

The squadroom and the socialization of new members

Recruiting is a never-ending process for college activities. Each year new students must enter the program and become members of the program. While there is some formal socialization and indoctrination, most of the process of becoming a productive member of the group is informal. As one Director of Forensics noted, the socialization that goes on in the squadroom "is very helpful because students have a richer understanding of the activity due to this exposure. The richer the understanding, the more likely the student will be able to extrapolate appropriate behaviors." Clearly the opportunities identified in the above section on functions of a squadroom directly relate to Cheney's (1983) discussion of developing skills and abilities as part of the socialization process. The squadroom does much more than just provide an opportunity for new members to develop skills.

Storytelling is also an important component of helping to socialize members into the program because the narrative serves as a way to educate novices about team practices and culture. Participants were asked about engaging in "forensics storytelling," or telling stories about forensics, either of current or former competitors or to tell members about the norms of the team. Seventy-two participants responded to this item, with 80.6 % (n=58) of those responding saying that they did engage in some kind of forensics storytelling. One novice who had not yet been to a tournament said, "I listen to travel stories about tournaments. I also listen to the hundreds of inside jokes that I don't understand." Another novice said, "We talk about forensics stuff: ballots, judges, other competitors, and qualifications, that kind of stuff." Varsity students acknowledged that they talked about forensics related issues but put a greater emphasis on discussions about personal relationships. Because novice competitors seem to tune into the stories about forensics more, it would be safe to assume they are learning their role in the program and the activity through these stories. Fisher (1985) contends that people are homo-narans and we only understand our world through stories. Stories are also used in the socialization process to help new members understand their new roles as well as the roles of the organization. "In an organizational context, narratives function to socialize newcomers, to solve problems, to legitimate power relationships, to enhance bonding and organizational identification, and to reduce uncertainty" (Putnam, Phillips, & Chapman, 1996, p. 375). Varsity members understand the importance of stories to socialize novices some extent. One varsity member recalls telling a story about a former competitor who had misread an extemporaneous speaking question only to realize the mistake immediately before entering the final round at a national tournament. The varsity member summed up the story by saying "The moral of the story is: 'Always read the question at least twice before you answer it.'"

Identification and the squadroom

One thing that the presence of a squadroom does is to push the identification process is to get students to spend time in the squadroom when they are not

doing forensics activities. The squadroom serves as a place for students to "hang out" and learn all the little things that coaches sometimes forget to tell them. These social interactions are where students learn the behavioral roles and norms that Cheney (1983) referred to as socialization. Having the opportunity to interact extensively with varsity members in a social setting prior to traveling with the team is one way that potential members will feel like full members of the organization. As one student put it, "We are all very busy people and without the squadroom I don't think we would ever see each other except for in the van." Without the squadroom new members would be traveling to their first tournament with a team of which they do not really feel a part.

Clearly, the squadroom serves an almost irreplaceable role in socializing members into the organization. However, these interactions go beyond building a sense of team spirit. These interactions develop a commitment to the program and to the activity. The squadroom is also critical to getting students to "identify" with the program. When asked what students liked most about the squadroom, one student said that the squadroom was completely dedicated to the team; another participant noted that their squadroom was designed to be "forensics-centered." When students spend 40 or 50 hours a week on an extra-curricular activity they are exhibiting great commitment to the activity. That kind of commitment does not come without a sense of identification with the program. Through the interpersonal interactions in the squadroom, students come to realize they have much in common with the other members of the team. They usually find that they are competitive, intelligent, creative, and expressive. These traits have often set them apart from groups they have been in previously. In this group, they find those characteristics as areas of common ground.

Building community and providing a haven

Looking past the physical benefits of the squadroom as a place to house a team, store extemp tubs, or research speeches, the squadroom serves as a sanctuary of sorts, a haven for team members to come together and build community. A varsity competitor described the squadroom as "a haven, a safe-space, and an escape." Another varsity member said, "I like the team room because it is a haven where you can escape the pressures of college life and just lounge, do work, practice, eat, sleep, and do just about anything." A novice competitor combined the ideas of a haven and of community when saying, "It is a haven of sorts for me. It is a place where I can go and feel like I belong there, I know there will always be friendly supportive people there to talk to and hang out with. The others there share common interests and goals, and therefore understand a large part of my life." One student summed up the importance of squadroom by saying, "It's our home away from home." This significant tribute to the necessity of the squadroom highlights the commitment many of the students demonstrate to achieving recognition and excellence.

Discussion

This study revealed the importance of a squadroom from a functional and pragmatic standpoint. It also helped to define the role a squadroom plays in socializing new members and in getting members to identify with the program. Finally, thematic analyses of the survey responses indicate that students and coaches view the squadroom as a haven that is part of a unique sense of community. The fact that the squadroom is central to the socialization of new members justifies its existence even in a department where office space is at a premium. Because forensics programs are constantly adding new members to their ranks, it would be impractical (and probably ineffective) to socialize each member in a formal socialization process. Rather, by allowing them to interact freely in a "safe" environment that is unique to forensics, the socialization process is advanced in a very effective manner.

The squadroom is not just a place for communication; it is a form of communication. Among other things, the squadroom communicates that the department has made a physical commitment to the activity. The artifacts that fill the squadroom also communicate the values and culture to new members. As coaches or Directors of Forensics we need to make sure the messages being sent are congruous with the messages we want to send. Part of the socialization process is to learn the norms and customs of the new organization. New members learn these things through observation, interpersonal interaction and stories or narratives. A squadroom provides an environment where people who understand and appreciate the activity can discuss forensics freely and openly.

The forensics squadroom is clearly virgin territory for researchers to explore. The results of this study would indicate that it is also a fertile area to study. Communication scholars who study issues of "space and place" (Aden, 1995; Cooks & Aden 1995) may find a unique development of community in the interactions within the squadroom. The students made several comments about how the room created a sense of community among the people who regularly utilize the room. One Director of Forensics directly stated that the squadroom "allowed the students to develop a sense of community." The results of this study could be incorporated into a larger study with observers at other institutions making similar observations and asking similar questions. Hopefully that would lead to generalizable themes and common elements that could provide a richer explanation of the role squadrooms play in programs.

Quantitative researchers interested in measuring the impact of the squadroom could compare level of participation and commitment of students who utilize the squadroom with the same factors of students who don't utilize the squadroom or spend significantly less time in the squadroom. Additional research on a national level could also focus on the competitive differences between programs that have squadrooms and those that do not have squadrooms if a reasonable number of programs without squadrooms could be identified.

The results of this study also could be applicable to businesses. If having a space where members of an organization could go to socialize, discuss life, and

the activities of the group, then businesses could start to foster and expedite the socialization process. We are not suggesting that businesses develop squadrooms but rather that they make a conscious effort to provide social interaction opportunities for their employees. With companies moving to ideas like casual day on Fridays and team-based organizational charts, the need to have opportunity to interact and socialize becomes more palatable. A squadroom could be compared to a company bar (but without the alcohol) or lunchroom. It is a place where people from the organization go to meet and talk about more than just work. It is where people begin to identify with the organization and really feel that they are a part of the group. It is a place where people gather to form a sense of commitment and community.

References

American Forensics Association. (2004, November). *Annual business meeting*. Conducted at the annual meeting of the National Communication Association in Chicago, IL.

Aden, R. C. (1995). Nostalgic communication as temporal escape: "When It Was a Game's" re-construction of a baseball/work community. *Western Journal of Communication, 59*, 20-38.

Adler, R. B. & Towne, N. (1996). *Looking out looking in: Interpersonal communication*. New York: Holt, Rhinehart & Winston.

Bullis, C. (1993). Organizational socialization research: Enabling, constraining, and shifting perspectives. *Communication Monographs, 60*, 10-17.

Burke, K. (1972). *Dramatism and Development*. Barre, Massachusetts: Clark University Press.

Cawyer, C. S., & Friedrich, G. W. (1998). Organizational socialization: Processes for new communication faculty. *Communication Education, 47*, 234-245.

Cheney, G. (1983). The rhetoric of identification and the study of organizational communication. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 69*, 143-158.

Cooks, L. & Aden, R. (1995). "Northern exposure's" sense of place: Constructing and marginalizing the matriarchal community. *Women s Studies in Communication, 18*, 1-17.

Duncan, W. J. (1985). The superiority theory of humor at work: Joking relationships as indicators of formal and informal status patterns in small, task oriented groups. *Small Group Behavior, 16*, 556-563.

Edelmayer, K. M. (1998). Resolved: Debate as a cult. A paper presented at the National Communication Association Convention in New York City, New York.

Engleberg, I. N. (1993). Frankfurters to Forensics. *Communication Education, 42*, 307-309, 399.

Feldman, D. C. (1976). A contingency theory of socialization. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 21*, 433-452.

Feldman, D. C. (1981). The multiple socialization of organization members. *Academy of Management Review, 6*, 309-318.

Fisher, W. R. (1985). The narrative paradigm: In the beginning. *Journal of Communication, 35*, 74-89.

Gibson, M. K., & Papa, M. J. (2000). The mud, the blood, and the beer guys: Organizational osmosis in blue-collar work groups. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 28*, 68-88.

Harter, L. M., & Kirby, E. L. (In press). Socializing medical students in an era of managed care: The ideological significance of standardized and virtual patients. *Communication Studies*.

Hefling, J. L. (1998). Criteria for identifying a cult. A paper presented at the National Communication Association Convention in New York City, New York.

- Hindman, M., Shackelford, J., & Schlottach, K. (1993). *Working forensics: A competitor's guide* (2nd ed.). Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt Publishing.
- Holm, T. T. (1998). Fitting the criteria: Individual events. A paper presented at the National Communication Association Convention in New York City, New York.
- Kelly, J. W. (1985). Storytelling in high tech organizations: A medium for sharing culture. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 13, 45-58.
- Kimble, J. J. (1998). Deprogramming: Lessons to be learned. A paper presented at the National Communication Association Convention in New York City, New York.
- Kreps, G. (1991). *Organizational communication: Theory and practice* (2nd ed.). New York: Longman.
- Mattingly, D. (2001). Place, teenagers, and representations: Lessons from a community theatre project. *Social & Cultural Geography*, 2, 445- 459.
- Miller, V. D. & Jablin, F. M. (1991). Information seeking during organizational entry: Influences, tactics, and a model of the process. *Academy of Management Review*, 16, 92-120.
- Moran, L., Skeggs, B., Tyrer, P., & Corteen, K. (2001). Property, boundary, exclusion: Making sense of hetero-violence in safer spaces. *Social & Cultural Geography*, 2, 407-420.
- Oseroff-Varnell, D. (1998). Communication and the socialization of dance students: An analysis of the hidden curriculum in a residential arts school. *Communication Education*, 47, 101-119.
- Pettigrew, A. M. (1979). On studying organizational cultures. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 24, 570-581.
- Putnam, L. L., Phillips, N. & Chapman, P. (1996). Metaphors of communication and organization. In S. R. Clegg, C. Hardy & W. JR. Nord (Eds.), *Handbook of organization studies*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.
- Rubin, R. B., Rubin, A. M., & Piele, L. J. (1996). *Communication research: Strategies and sources* (4th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wads worth.
- Saks, A. M. (1997). Organizational socialization: Making sense of the past and present as a prologue to the future. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 51, 234-279.
- Shonk, J. H. (1992). *Team-based organizations: Developing a successful team environment*. Homewood, IL: Business One Irwin.
- Souza, T. J. (1999). Communication and alternative school student socialization. *Communication Education*, 48, 91-108.
- Taylor, B. (1975). Utilizing the forensics team for study in small group process. *The Speech Teacher*, 24, 71-73.
- VanMaanen, J. (1973). Observations on the making of policemen. *Human Organization*, 32, 407-417
- VanMaanen, J. (1975). Breaking in: A consideration of organizational socialization. In R. Dubin (Ed.), *Handbook of Work Organizations and Society*. Chicago: Rand McNally Chicago: Rand McNally College Pub. Co.

Weick, K. E. (1987). Theorizing about organizational communication. In F. Jablin, L. Putnam, K. Roberts, & L. Porter (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational communication* (pp. 679-740). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Winberenner, T. C. (1997). *Intercollegiate Forensics* (2nd ed.). Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company.

Duties of the Director of Forensics:
Step One in the Development of an Interviewing
and Evaluation Instrument

David A. Williams, Texas Tech University

Joseph A. Gantt, Texas Tech University

Abstract

This study sought to create an instrument to assist in the hiring and evaluation of Directors of Forensics (DOF). Initially, 97 respondents provided 612 responses identifying the most important duties of the director of forensics. These items were categorized into four emergent themes (administrative duties, team management, coaching, and faculty member responsibilities). An instrument was then created to help identify the respondents' perceived importance of the four job duty categories. The instrument was then pilot tested. The instrument could be used to identify priorities among potential DOF job candidates or to help in the annual evaluation of DOFs. The instrument could also be completed by department chair, administrators, and forensics students to help identify the level of mutual understanding all parties share with regard to the duties of the Director of Forensics.

The health of a forensics program depends on numerous factors. Foremost among those are active student involvement, institutional support, and strong program leadership. The Director of Forensics (DOF) may be the single most influential force in determining the success, failure, and longevity of a program. Forensics directors, may handle significant or all coaching duties, plan travel arrangements, coordinate team functions, monitor individual student growth, produce public relations efforts directed toward the department, college, university or local community and many other functions. The job-related duties of the DOF can become quite extensive thus making hiring and evaluation decisions difficult. As Michael Bartanen (1994) noted:

Individuals who teach and coach forensics must be dedicated "jack of all trade" teachers. They must understand the many kinds of events that make up forensics activity, know how to motivate student competitors, and be able to adapt teaching strategies to the special circumstances of contest speaking. Ironically, no special certification is required for forensics teachers and coaches; indeed, few classes are available from which to learn the necessary skills (p. xiii).

This research project was designed to assist in the hiring and evaluation process of DOFs by determining which duties are most commonly perceived to be related to the position. This study surveyed members of the forensics commu-

nity to identify the most important duties of the DOF. These duties were categorized into emergent themes. An instrument was then created to help determine where a DOF, or applicant for a DOF position, places his or her emphasis among the prevailing themes and how important they view the other themes.

Previous Literature

DOF Duties

Previous research on the role of the DOF has touched on many issues ranging from liability issues and management concerns, to reasons why coaches quit. This line of investigation has given insight into the DOF's duties and how DOF's are evaluated.

Twenty years ago, Donn Parson (1984) noted the forensics professional "holds a regular faculty appointment and is eligible for reappointment, promotion, tenure and merit salary increases in accordance with the normal procedures of the institution" (p. 5).

However, since that time, the similarity between DOFs and other faculty members has been called into question with regard to workload and expectations.

Some discussion of the evaluation of DOFs is couched in terms of the traditional means of evaluating faculty through the trio of teaching, research, and service. In 1994, Edward Panetta reported on discussion from the "Quail Roost Conference" which was a meeting of the Professional Development and Support Committee of the American Forensic Association. Committee members were guided by the categories of teaching, research and service in their suggestions for how Directors of Debate should be evaluated. The committee suggested directors have a clearly defined research program and clear understanding of their departments' requirements. They also emphasized the need for appropriate administrative support and release time when extensive research requirements exist. The coaching and judging of debate was considered a primary component of the teaching mission and could be evaluated through graduation rates, composite team grade point averages, and even competitive success. Finally, the committee revealed that debate directors would occasionally maintain regional and national level service functions that make them somewhat unique in comparison to their non-forensics junior faculty counterparts. Porter (1986), however, previously noted that DOFs reported difficulty in their administrations' attempts to fit forensics administration into the categories of teaching, research, and service.

Workman (1997) took a more job-specific view of hiring and promotion when he presented a helpful list of competencies required for the position. These competencies include the following:

1. Instructional competency included knowledge of communication theory and practice, expertise in performance, and an ability to evaluate student progress.

2. Financial management requires the DOF to be able to work with a budget, understand financial statements, and participate in fundraising efforts.
3. Leadership and responsibility abilities require the DOF to be skilled in problem solving, able to motivate students and develop policy to guide the program.
4. Administrative competencies include the ability to organize, multi-task, manage paperwork and meet deadlines.
5. Interpersonal competencies are also required with skills in listening, showing empathy, assisting with student problems, and maintaining healthy relationships.
6. Professional competencies include the need to develop and abide by a philosophy for performance, knowledge of the contest rules, and understanding how to evaluate performances.

An even more unique and specific list of job expectations was offered by Burnett & Danielson (1992). They were concerned with the training of DOFs. Their insights led to the creation of a set of specific job functions that DOFs must learn. They include: accounting and book keeping, administering the program, arranging participation in tournaments, coaching, and recruiting. Identified as lesser tasks were public relations, coordinating college/university service programs, and tournament hosting (p. 17).

This work helped respond to Porter's (1986) call for a "determination of the job responsibilities of forensic personnel" (p. 13) but does not address all of the concerns with the DOF's job related expectations. Douglas's (1971) concern of long ago is probably more prevalent now than ever. Douglas revealed that administrations have a tendency to appoint DOFs at lower ranks and with higher teaching loads. Bartanen (1996a) as well, noted the problem with DOFs and forensics teaching assistants being over-burdened and needing the opportunity to rotate out of their positions for a break. Porter (1986) revealed that progress has been made in the workload issue. She found in her survey that there were more senior faculty in DOF positions with more release time than their counterparts who participated in a similar survey by Klopff & Rives (1965) over twenty years earlier.

More recent research has debated the issue of junior vs. senior faculty members serving as DOFs. In separate articles in the Summer 1999 issue of the *International Journal of Forensics*, Sheffield and McDonald identified the benefits and detriments of the Ph.D. tenured, Director of Forensics. Sheffield posits that the notion of an M. A. degreed person, serving as a DOF, not being viewed as an integral part of the faculty is faulty. He cites examples in which terminal M.A. DOFs developed central and important roles in their departments. Sheffield also noted that the terminal M.A. DOF might excel in the area of coaching because of a lack of competing departmental duties, presumably research.

McDonald (1999) countered that forensics, like other disciplines, has been turning to part-time, non-tenure track faculty more frequently. McDonald noted,

this trend is true in forensics and warns, "This has the net effect of diluting the professional standing of debate and speech coaches, undermining the important mentoring and scholarly contributions made by coaches and will, in the long term, be detrimental to the long-term health of debate and speech programs" (p. 150-151).

Bartanen (1996a) also echoed a recurrent claim that respondents in her survey complained of unclear evaluation criteria and a lack of direction in their professional development. A question left unanswered to date is to what degree the tenure track DOF has more unclear explanations about expectations than their non-forensics colleagues. Certainly, those outside of forensics have offered the same concern regarding their evaluation. It may be that a degree of perceived uncertainty is inherent in a process that carries so much importance for both the person being evaluated and the people doing the evaluation. This lack of clarity, in part, results from the dual evaluation of the DOF as a faculty member who has traditional duties of teaching, research, and service and the evaluation that does or does not take place on the competencies outlined by Workman (1997) and others.

The DOF positions carry with it some unique tasks that raise liability issues and concerns for many in the profession. Voight and Ward (1998) identify, not surprisingly, travel as a primary liability concern for DOFs. Travel is a standard duty of many DOFs. The researchers warn that travel behaviors that exceed the standard of "ordinary care" (e.g. driving in bad weather or over the speed limit) put the director in jeopardy. Similarly, issues of drug and alcohol use, sexual harassment, copyright infringement, and work with high school students in workshops can all be areas of legal liability. Porter and Sommemess (1991) offer useful advice to DOFs. They suggest director's have a thorough understanding of their contract, be proactive, and use common sense to prevent problems before they arise. They further maintain that DOFs should purchase the maximum insurance coverage they can, and gather appropriate medical and liability release forms. This line of research suggests that the DOF has responsibilities concerning the well-being and safety (particularly during travel) of forensics students which is not always easy to measure in an evaluation process.

Why people leave the profession

Some of the DOF duties and expectations for hiring and evaluation are identified in research addressing why people quit. Murphy and Ferri (1991) surveyed over 100 DOFs on their job satisfaction. One discovery from their research is that the burden of forensics-related duties may make DOFs feel professionally limited. Furthermore, there is a prevalence of feeling unappreciated by upper administration. Gills (1990) helped identify specific duties that might be burdening DOFs. She noted that in previous research, competitiveness, educational value, and ethics were primary concerns for DOFs. Her study revealed travel, lack of training, and competition as elements of the forensic profession that were most detrimental to the DOF's longevity in the profession. Bartanen (1996b)

echoed this concern with travel, training, and time commitment hindering retention of forensics faculty. Her comprehensive survey revealed that respondents felt the season was too long and tournament schedules were too demanding. They, of course, also recounted the often heard complaint that the travel requirements were too demanding.

Bartanen's (1996b) survey also revealed what would appear logical consequences to the long season and extensive travel. Respondents reported that they lacked time for exercise and fitness and that tournament travel contributed to unhealthy eating habits. Coaches also reported the quality of their family relationship time was hindered as well as opportunities for socialization or entertainment outside of forensics.

Bartanen's (1996b) findings are similar to those of Preston (1995) who specified the following seven contributing factors to coach burnout.

1. length of season
2. pay
3. research priorities
4. funding/recruitment/retention challenges
5. predatory recruiting of students from one program to another
6. negative perceptions of forensics in the discipline
7. factionalism in the forensic organizations

Douglas (1971) also identified salary concerns as a reason why DOFs do not stay in their positions.

This line of research has not been completely devoid of suggestions for DOFs to help make their position more manageable. Dreibelbis (1989) and Rhodes (1990) advocate approaching the DOF position from an organizational perspective. Collectively, they suggest that DOFs foster a unified sense of decision-making and delegation of authority. Rhodes further utilizes goal setting, a reward system for improvement and task completion, and frequent feedback on performance.

The need for training is the final suggestion from the line of research on how to improve the DOF's ability to accomplish the range of duties required of them. Burnett & Danielson (1992) claimed lack of training is a primary reason why DOFs leave the profession. Bartanen (1996a) echoes that same call for training and suggested the creation of training sessions. Another means for acquiring training is through graduate courses designed to prepare DOFs. Hassencahl (1993) reviewed such courses and found the most prominent topics to be directing, coaching, administration/management, objectives of programs, philosophy of forensics education, relevant theories, and starting/establishing a program.

The most common means of training likely happens through a form of mentoring. Carver (1993) suggests that ex-DOFs could serve as mentors provided they are ready to relinquish control, and are still in-touch with the activity and profession. Congalton and Olson (2002) conducted a survey of former DOFs and found they had developed useful skills during their tenure in forensics and they

were typically willing to help new DOFs at their institutions. Multi-tasking was the most important skill DOFs had developed and were able to use in other administrative positions after forensics. The authors also noted that while former directors reported being willing to help, they may not offer it for fear of being too pushy or they may not be asked by new directors for their assistance.

Previous research has reflected on the range of duties performed by the DOF. However, the research has not specifically attempted to itemize or categorize those duties in an effort to create an instrument that helps in the hiring and evaluation process. This study undertook the task of identifying a full range of DOF duties and placing them in emergent themes. These themes were then used to develop an instrument to help selection committees in the hiring process and review committees in the evaluation process.

Method

An on-line survey was constructed which asked respondents to provide demographic information, information about their rank as student or different levels of faculty, events they participate in or coach, and the size of the forensics program they participate in. The survey then asked respondents to list up to 12 duties they believe are important for Directors of Forensics programs to perform. Requests for survey respondents were placed on forensics list-serves. The request included a link to the on-line survey that took approximately five to ten minutes to complete. Survey data gathering in this manner has been established as an appropriate means for gathering information provided potential respondents have reasonable access to the necessary technology (Saris, 1991).

Ninety-seven respondents completed the survey. Fifty-eight of the respondents were male, 32 female, and seven did not report their sex. As to position, 48 identified themselves as Director of Forensics, 14 as undergraduate students, 10 as Director of Debate, nine as graduate student, seven as Assistant Director of Forensics, three as Former Director of Forensics, four as full-time faculty, one as Interim Director of Forensics, and one as Administrative. As to rank, 15 respondents had tenure, 10 were tenure track, 10 were instructors, 19 were full-time non-tenure track, eight were adjunct faculty, 10 were graduate students, 1 was part-time, 1 was an administrator, 3 were volunteers, and 14 were undergraduate students.

The most prevalent combination of events coaching or participating in was Individual Events and Parliamentary Debate with a total of 16 respondents. CEDA/NDT and Individual Events were second with 12 respondents each. Eighteen other combinations of events followed with eight or fewer respondents each. Respondents also identified the size of their program in increments of 10 students. Twenty-nine respondents were from programs of 0 to 10 participants, 34 from programs with 11 to 20 students, 18 from programs with 21 to 30 students, nine from programs with 31 to 40 students, four from programs with 41 to 50 students, and one respondent from a program with 51 or more students. Two respondents did not answer this item.

Following analysis of the 97 surveys, the instrument was created by taking the top three responses from each of four emergent (DOF duty) themes. A second survey (see Appendix A) was created and administered as a pilot test to seventeen forensics professionals attending the National Parliamentary Debate Association National Championship Tournament. All respondents to the second survey were DOFs or ADOFs. The 12 item survey asked respondents to rank order the DOF duties in terms of importance with 1 being the most important, 12 the least important. To score the survey, the three ranks attributed to each of the four emergent themes were totaled. The emergent theme with the lowest totaled ranks would be the area the respondent views as most important. (See Appendix B for scoring sample.)

Results

DOF duties and themes

Ninety-seven respondents provided a total of 612 responses. The 612 responses were categorized into 45 different items with frequencies ranging from 1 to 70. The 15 most frequent responses are provided below.

Duty	<u># of Responses</u>
1. Coach	70
2. Arrange Travel	64
3. Budget	58
4. Recruiting	49
5. Public Relations	35
6. Hire/Manage Coaches	30
7. Campus Networking	29
8. Funding/Fundraising	29
9. Administrative/Paperwork	24
10. Travel	22
11. Vision/Plan/Goal Setting	18
12. Team Unity/Management	16
13. Host Tournaments	15
14. Give Back/Service	15
15. Teach/Student Growth	14

These 15 items represent the most frequently noted responsibilities of DOFs. Coaching was the most frequently noted responsibility with two administrative duties following in second and third. Respondents did make a distinction between arranging travel (2nd most frequent response) and traveling to tournaments (10th most frequent response).

The 45 items were grouped into four emergent themes. The themes, and items included in the themes, are listed below. Each item is followed by a number that represents the frequency with which respondents listed it and that

categories' percentage of the total number of (612) responses . The emergent themes are: Administrative duties, Team management, Coaching, and Faculty member responsibilities.

Table 1

Item Frequencies Within Emergent Categories

Administrative Duties (281, 46%)

Arrange Travel	64
Budget	58
Public Relations	35
Campus Networking	29
Funding/Fundraising	29
Administrative/Paperwork	24
Vision/Plan/Goal Setting	18
Host Tournaments	15
Get materials/space	4
Maintain website	2
Nationals Selection	1
Work with Student Govt.	1
Team Representative	1

Team Management (137, 22 %)

Recruit	49
Hire/manage coaches	30
Mange team unity	16
Discipline	11
Social/Emotional Support	11
Run Team Meetings	8
Conflict Resolution	5
Scholarship Selection	4
Squad Diversity	1
Encourage Other Programs	1
Supervise Team Officers	1

Coaching (137, 22 %)

Coach	70
Travel	22
Do/Teach Research	9
Judge	8
On Campus Programming	8
Help with pieces/speeches	6
Network with other coaches	4
Debate knowledge	4

Coach at tournaments	3
National Ranking	1
I.E. Knowledge	1
Coach Novices	1

Faculty Member Responsibilities (57, 9%)

Give Back/Service	15
Teach/Student Growth	14
Academic Advisor	12
State, Regional, National Meetings	7
Faculty Meetings	6
Grade	1
Forensics Research	1
Write Recommendations	1

The administrative duties theme had the most items identified by respondents with 13 different responses being listed a total of 281 times. The team management and coaching theme were second in frequency. Team management had 11 items listed 137 times and coaching had 12 items listed 137 times. There was a sizable drop to faculty member responsibilities with 8 items being listed 57 times.

DOF Duties Instrument

The pilot test instrument developed by the emergent theses was administered to seventeen DOFs and ADOFs. Administrative duties were scored as the most important set of DOF duties for 12 of the respondents. Coaching was most important for three respondents while team management was the top concern for the remaining two respondents.

The pilot test also demonstrated that surveys can be tabulated and assessments can be made about the relative priority given to each of the four areas of DOF duties.

For example, one respondent's score indicated a total of 6 in the administrative duties category with the next lowest sum being 22 for both team management and coaching. The scores would indicate for this respondent that administrative duties are very clearly perceived to be the most important element of their job. Another respondents' survey also indicated administrative duties to be the most important set of DOF duties with a total of 13; however, team management followed closely behind with a total of 14. In this case, the respondents' view of administrative duties is that they are only slightly more important than their team management responsibilities.

Discussion

Identification of the emergent themes

The frequencies of items within categories might suggest that the DOF is perceived as one whose primary responsibility is administrative, followed by team management and coaching duties. Administrative duties accounted for 46 percent of the responses while team management and coaching were each 22 percent.

While the prominence of these themes is likely not surprising, the order of their prevalence is informative. Many prospective DOFs and non-forensics faculty colleagues might think of coaching duties first when they consider the DOF position. While they are surely aware of administrative responsibilities that accompany the position, the number of administrative responses in this study, and the individual listing of these duties, will help both prospective DOFs and faculty colleagues and supervisors more fully understand the non-coaching elements of the position.

Faculty member responsibilities accounted for only 9 percent of the responses, but this role of the DOF position should not be overlooked. Each theme had at least one item in the list of top 15 DOF responsibilities. Furthermore, an important insight might be gained from the smallest category, faculty member responsibilities. First, it should be noted that respondents might not have considered responsibilities outside of forensic practice when responding to the request of "Please list the most important duties of the DOF." With that limitation aside, the lack of perceived attention given to faculty responsibilities might become problematic for those who accept positions as DOFs. While those in the forensics community may de-emphasize some of the faculty member responsibilities, those who evaluate them might not. Colleagues, supervisors, department chairs, and deans may place greater weight on the faculty member responsibilities. Lucy Keele and Kenneth Anderson reported in 1975 that one of the major problems in the profession was that "forensics personnel are measured by the same criteria as their colleagues" (p. 145). Although this concern is over a quarter-century old, it may still exist. A DOF might focus energy on the coaching and administrative responsibilities, and excel in those areas, but then be penalized if they falter in faculty member responsibilities that are more valued by those conducting the evaluation.

Pilot Test

The pilot test revealed that respondents were able to complete the instrument without confusion over the meanings of particular terms or any other element of the survey. The instrument created in this study may be a feasible means for identifying how job candidates, current DOFs, and even those who evaluate DOFs view the duties of the DOF. Department chairs, and other administrators, could be asked to complete the survey to provide helpful information at

an early stage of the hiring or performance review process. For example, a newly hired DOF might complete the instrument and have it reveal that she places a clear priority on duties associated with coaching. But, the department chair and college dean's survey results might indicate a focus on administrative duties. Identifying this discrepancy in how the position is viewed and the different foci being brought by both parties can help limit problems later in the evaluation process. The new DOF, chair, and college dean could compare their results and then engage in discussion to clarify expectations for the position.

Some program directors may wish to administer the instrument to their assistant coaches (if the program has assistants) and student competitors. The similarities or differences in perceptions of the DOFs' job duties might lead to an important discussion about those duties. Such a discussion, guided by the different scores, can go a long way to clarifying for all how the DOF will need to spend his or her time and what will receive priority.

Scoring of the instrument also allows for evaluation of the relative importance respondents give to each of the DOF duty categories. Similar scores on these two categories indicate that the respondent views those as similar in importance. Likewise, a very low total on one category with the other three being higher by eight or more would indicate that the respondent would choose to spend the majority of their time on that category of the DOF duties.

The preponderance of responses indicating a focus on the administrative duties of the DOF position calls for additional testing of the instrument to determine its' validity. The current pilot test only indicates the clarity of the items and how the scoring works. Additional means (e.g. test-retest, addition of an open-ended question on the survey, or interviewing respondents after they have completed the instrument) should be used to determine validity of the instrument or make needed changes.

Additional data gathering on the emergent themes might help verify the themes presented in this study or alter the top three elements in each category. This future research could also attempt to distinguish between student, faculty, and administrative views of the DOF's duties.

This study has sought to assist DOFs, their programs, administrators, and students by identifying the range of responsibilities that accompany the position. An instrument has been created that would allow all parties to identify their perceptions regarding the relative importance of those duties. It is hoped this instrument will be tested, developed further, and utilized to establish a more unified understanding of the DOFs responsibilities both nationally and at individual institutions.

References

- Bartanen, K.M. (1996a). A preliminary assessment of the professional climate of forensic education, part 1. *The Forensic*, 81, 1-21.
- Bartanen, K.M. (1996b). A preliminary assessment of the professional climate of forensic education, part 2, *The Forensic*, 82, 1-15.
- Bartanen, M.D. (1994). *Teaching & directing forensics*. Scottsdale: Gorsuch Scarisbrick, Publishers.
- Burnett, P.A. & Danielson, M.A. (1992). Analysis of forensics programs administration: What will the 1990's bring? *National Forensic Journal*, 10, 11-18.
- Carver, C.R. (1993). The role of the ex-forensics director as a mentor. *The Forensic*, 78, 17-22.
- Congalton, K.J. & Olson, CD. (2002). Former forensics directors don't die and they shouldn't fade away. *Speaker and Gavel*, 39, 36-41.
- Douglas, D.G. (1971). Toward a philosophy of forensic education. *Journal of American Forensic Association*, 7, 36-41.
- Dreibelbis, G.C. (1989). The director of forensics, assistant director and staff: An Organizational communication perspective. *National Forensic Journal*, 7, 63-70.
- Gill, M. (1990). Why forensic coaches quit: A replication and extension. *National Forensic Journal*, 8, 179-188.
- Hassencahl, F. (1993). The status of graduate courses designed for directors of forensics programs. *The Forensic*, 79, 1-15.
- Keele, L.M. & Andersen, K.E. (1975). Professional preparation, status, and rewards. In (Ed.) J.H. McBath, *Forensics as communication: An argumentative perspective*, Skokie: National Textbook. Co.
- Klopf, D. & Rives, S. (1965). Characteristics of high school and college forensics directors. *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, 2, 33-37.
- McBath, J.H. (1975). *Forensics as communication: An argumentative perspective*. Skokie: National Textbook Co.
- McDonald, K. (1999). Tenure and coaching: A necessary relationship or antagonism? *The International Journal of Forensics*, 1, 150-154.
- Murphy & Ferri (1991). Job satisfaction of faculty members in forensics: A national study. *The Forensic*, 76, 1-9.
- Panetta, E. (1994). Quail roost conference. *The Forensic*, 79, 16-25.
- Parson, D. (1984). American forensics in perspective. Annandale, VA. Speech Communication Association.
- Porter, S. (1986). Evaluating the forensic director: Is there a problem? *The Forensic*, 72, 6-13.
- Porter, S.B. & Sommerness, M.D. (1991). Legal issues confronting the director of Forensics. *National Forensic Journal*, 9, 109-124.
- Preston, C.T. (1995). Contributing factors to coach burnout and brain drain in forensics: Some suggestions for credibility and activity survival. *The Forensic*, 80, 16-22.
- Rhodes, J. (1990). The director of forensics as coach. *The Forensic*, 75, 18-23.

Saris, W.E. (1991). *Computer-assisted interviewing*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Sheffield, W. (1999). The renewable term appointment. *The International Journal of Forensics, 1*, 142-145.

Voight, P. & Ward, C. (1998). Liability implications of forensic program administration. Contemporary argumentation and debate. *19*, 1-17.

Workman, T.A. (1997). Solving for a healthy future: Creating national standards for training future directors of forensics. A paper presented at the 3rd National Developmental Conference on Individual Events, Rice University.

Appendix A

Pilot Test Instrument

Please rank the following twelve items in order of importance (1=most important, 12=least important) with regard to the duties of a Director of Forensics. Thank you for your assistance.

Work on/monitor the budget

Hire/Manage coaches

Travel to tournaments

Teach/Student growth

Arrange travel

Recruit students

Coach

Give back to forensics/service

Public relations

Manage team unity

Do team research/teach research skills

Academic advisor

Appendix B Sample**Instrument Score**

Please rank the following twelve items in order of importance (1=most important, 12=least important) with regard to the duties of a Director of Forensics. Thank you for your assistance.

- _1__ Work on/monitor the budget (Admin, duties)*
- _6__ Hire/Manage coaches (Team management)
- _2__ Travel to tournaments (Coach)
- _5__ Teach/Student growth (Faculty member)
- _3__ Arrange travel (Admin, duties)
- 11_ Recruit students (Team management)
- _7_ Coach (Coach)
- 10_ Give back to forensics/service (Faculty member)
- 4 _ Public relations (Admin, duties)
- _9 _ Manage team unity (Team management)
- _8__ Do team research/teach research skills (Coach)
- 12_ Academic advisor (Faculty member)

*Items in parentheses did not appear on the survey. They are included here to identify which emergent theme each items was derived from.

Administrative duties total = 8 (1+3+4)
 Coach total = 17 (2+7+8)
 Team management total = 26 (6+11+9)
 Faculty member total = 27 (5+10+12)

The State of Forensic Scholarship:
Analyzing Individual Events Research in the
National Forensic Journal from 1990-2003

Anne Gerbensky Kerber, Financial Services-Weber Shandwick

Daniel Cronn-Mills, Minnesota State University, Mankato

Abstract

For decades, scholars have lamented the quality and quantity of forensics research that has been published and presented at major conferences. While many have called for an audit of the current status of forensic scholarship, little has been done to pinpoint whether the need for increased quality forensic research has been met. This study examines the articles in National Forensic Journal published from 1990-2003, uncovering many critical trends that will aid in determining what still needs to be done regarding forensic scholarship in the 21st Century.

Scholars have called for quality research in forensics since the 1980s. The primary motivation for was the lack of support for the activity from institutions and the communication discipline (Porter, 1990, p. 95; Worth, 2000, p. 3). Although none of the scholars doubted the value of forensic participation, most stated further research was necessary to improve the perception of the activity. Porter (1990) notes, "the most significant problem facing the forensic community today is that we have neither documented nor articulated the importance of our area of expertise to the university community at large" (p. 95). Surveys of existing research found scholarship on forensics added little to communication theory, had significant problems in the use of methodology, and lacked basic research on the pedagogy of the activity (e.g., Klumpp, 1990; Porter, 1990; Worth, 2000). The problems of forensic research were noted and scholars offered ideas for future research to give the activity more prominence in the academic community. Little has been done to determine if the call for research in forensics has been met.

Our purpose is to study whether forensic scholarship has tackled the research agenda established by previous studies. We provide an in-depth analysis of research trends by focusing on scholarship in individual events. Using a method established by Logue and Shea (1990), we analyze individual events research published in the *National Forensic Journal* between 1990 and 2003 to determine its application to core issues within the activity, its utility to the forensic community and communication theory in general, and its use of structured research methods.

Review of Literature

Several scholars have broadly surveyed forensics research, focusing on the types of articles published in journals or presented at conferences, the methods used to study, and the applications this research has to the forensics community and communication theory (e.g., Klumpp, 1990; Logue and Shea, 1990; Porter, 1990; Worth, 2000). Klumpp (1990) states current forensics research falls into three categories: survey research on "attitudes and structural characteristics" of forensics programs; "how-to" essays on forensics activities; and "theoretical essays providing a vocabulary and structure for teaching skills" (p. 80). However, Klumpp (1990) argues forensics research tends to be flawed by the overuse of anecdotal evidence, pontification, and imperfect research methods (pp. 79-81). Worth (2000) similarly acknowledges his criticism and concern for improvements in forensics research, stating the body of scholarship requires "additional qualities to be successful in promoting the activity" (p. 7).

Scholars have also addressed the importance of forensics research. Porter (1990) offers four justifications for improving the quality of forensics research: enhancing the ability to secure tenure; elevating the forensics within the speech communication discipline; adding to the knowledge of the forensics; and enhancing the practical applications of forensics (pp. 96-98).

First, Porter (1990) states increased scholarly research in the forensics will enhance the ability of a forensics professional to earn tenure (p. 96). The importance of quality forensics scholarship is highlighted because schools do not always attribute the same value to a forensics professional's weekend travel or administrative duties as they do to published research. Parson (1990) argues the dominant criteria for faculty evaluation is and will continue to be research (p. 70). Porter (1990) states some institutions even have quotas for particular types of research or weighing mechanisms for evaluating publications (p. 96). Other studies indicate achieving tenure or job security is one of the primary reasons scholars engage in forensic research (Aden, 1990, p. 57; McKerrow, 1990, p. 74).

Second, Porter (1990) states improved research will elevate forensics within the speech communication discipline (p. 96). Forensic scholars have also sought to enhance the reputation of forensics by utilizing opportunities to publish their research in non-forensics related journals, and connecting forensics scholarship to communication theory. Worth (2000) argues forensics would benefit from publishing research on the activity in communication journals (p. 11). Worth notes, "in general, major journals in communication do not tend to feature research in forensics. This presents problems both in terms of ease with which one may find the literature and also the credibility accorded research by other communication scholars" (p. 11). In addition, scholars view the creation of stronger theoretical ties between forensics and communication research to be critical, as forensics programs are increasingly becoming isolated from speech curriculum (Swanson, 1992, p. 49). Kay (1990) attributes the isolation of forensic events the lack of theoretical foundation: "When practice exists independent of theory—or only loosely connected to that theory—the laboratory cannot be

judged adequate" (p. 65). Harris, Kropp and Rosenthal (1986) state research on individual events requires a greater connection to the discipline, because "despite its obvious roots in argumentation, persuasion, and rhetorical criticism, it has only begun to lay claim to its theoretical foundation" (p. 13). Other scholars suggest specific areas in communication research where forensics could add to the existing base of knowledge. A series of articles in the spring 1992 edition of the *National Forensic Journal* suggests forensics research should investigate the interpersonal, small group, and organizational communication aspects of the activity (e.g., Friedley, 1992; Swanson, 1992). Madsen (1990) states the study of forensics and argumentation theory can create opportunities for interdisciplinary research, incorporating concepts like policy systems analysis and hypothesis testing (p. 47).

Third, Porter (1990) states research would add to the knowledge of forensics (p. 97). Kay (1990) asserts forensics is an educational laboratory with the potential to generate knowledge about communication and argumentation (p. 64). However, one perceived shortcoming of research on individual events is the focus on competitive effectiveness. Aden (1990) argues, "much individual events research tells coaches and students how to fit in with the status quo instead of questioning the practices produced by the status quo" (p. 59). Because individual events research has focused the "product to be evaluated before an audience," scholars have addressed the need for more pedagogical research in individual events (Friedley, 1992, p. 51). Pedagogy is not the only area that needs to be further addressed by the forensics community. Scholars have also noted forensic professionals can successfully address other types of research. Porter (1990) states forensics provides numerous opportunities for increased historical, experimental and descriptive research (pp. 98-99). Porter argues this type of study "can and would establish or verify the norms and standards of our activity" (p. 99). Worth (2000) advocates increased descriptive studies of forensics, because current research fails to "address the most basic question of whom current competitors and coaches are in forensics. Additionally, none of this research addresses what kinds of success forensics competitors experience after participation in forensics" (p. 8). He states the amount of time forensics professionals dedicate to the activity should be conducive to ethnographic studies of the activity (Worth, 2000, p. 12).

Finally, Porter (1990) states research would enhance the practical applications of the forensics (p. 98). Forensic scholars have long argued the activity should function as an "educational laboratory," providing opportunities for research on tournament design, the application of speaking skills to the real world, and information-processing and decision-making in persuasion (Harris, Kropp & Rosenthal, 1986). Dean (1992) states research in individual events offers several benefits for applied communication, including extending the value of forensics into other contexts and developing time-efficient coaching tools. While research on the practical applications of forensics exists, critics state this body of scholarship requires more depth. Klumpp (1990) states individual events research relies too heavily on anecdotes for articles on instruction. He recom-

mends these articles identify the context, objectives and "instructional skills necessary for the technique to succeed...Thus, the research achieves an analytical depth which carries it beyond anecdote" (Klumpp, 1990, p. 82).

While improving forensics research in general is viewed as a priority, the importance of quality scholarship for individual events seems particularly critical. Creating individual events research that is visible and applicable to other contexts is one area highlighted by previous literature. Harris, Kropp and Rosenthal (1986) state other areas of forensic research, such as debate, have extended scholarship beyond pedagogy, while individual events research has not done so (p. 13). In addition, the importance of applied research in individual events has been emphasized to help coaches and students understand the connection between theory and practice (Aden, 1990, p. 58).

Method

Our purpose is to analyze how published research on individual events has attempted to meet the research agenda established by previous critiques of forensic research. The study extends Logue and Shea's (1990) critique of individual events articles published in the *National Forensic Journal (NFJ)* between 1983 and 1989. Their framework for analysis is used to study individual events articles published in subsequent issues of the *NFJ*. Logue and Shea's framework was utilized because it provides a longitudinal approach to study the topic areas addressed, research methods used and applications of individual events research. Logue and Shea argue studying literature in the *NFJ* is representative of individual events scholarship in the 1980s because previous research indicates the journal publishes the "vast majority of individual events articles" (p. 19).

Logue and Shea's (1990) framework for analysis focuses on three specific elements of individual events research: (1) how research addresses the core issues of the discipline; (2) the generalizability of the research; and (3) the methodology used to conduct research (pp. 18-19).

First, Logue and Shea (1990) argue research on individual events should address the "core issues of the discipline" to ensure research is grounded in the discipline (p. 18). Using objectives outlined by forensic developmental conferences, Logue and Shea identify three core issues for individual events scholarship: forensics should function as an educational laboratory; the aim of the laboratory is the improvement of student skills; and the cornerstone of the laboratory is argumentation (p. 18). Logue and Shea further defined each core issue to determine how it was addressed by forensic research. They stated articles addressing the educational laboratory would discuss "pedagogical matters such as "how to" coach particular events of skills, "how to" judge events in the community, or "how to" structure tournaments or specific events" (p. 18). Logue and Shea said articles describing the improvement of student skills would address "benefits of forensic participation, measurement of skill improvement, or criticism of skill development" (p. 18). They argued articles on argumentation in individual events research discussed the reasoning provided for acts, beliefs, attitudes and values (p. 18).

Second, Logue and Shea (1990) examined the generalizability, or social utility, of individual events research. They studied each article to determine if it applied to a specific event, individual events in general, the entire forensics community, or argumentation or communication theory (pp. 18-19).

Finally, Logue and Shea (1990) identified the type of research method used in each article. Methods were grouped into three categories: qualitative, defined as research constructed in an "argumentative manner;" quantitative; or informative, "articles merely describing a situation or program, without arguing a position" (p. 19).

We analyze articles specifically addressing individual events published in the *NFJ* from Fall 1990 to Fall 2003 using Logue and Shea's (1990) framework. Articles on debate or the general forensics community published in the *NFJ* are not included as part of the study. First, articles addressing individual events re identified. Then, the articles are analyzed to determine how the three elements of Logue and Shea's framework are met. Finally, the results are discussed and the limitations of this study are addressed.

Results

The *National Forensic Journal* published thirty-three articles on individual events in the Fall 1990 through Fall 2003 issues. The most significant portion of the research was published in 1990 and 1991—each volume contained six articles on individual events (see Table 1). The number of published articles on individual events subsequently declined from 1992 to 2003 with no more than three articles per year. In fact, the *National Forensic Journal* did not publish in 1995, 1999, 2000, nor 2001. Three articles in volume 20, number 1 (Spring 2002) were reprinted articles published in early issues of the journal. The three articles were not double-counted in the analysis; the articles were only counted in the year of original publication. The year 2003 found a small resurgence (seven articles) in individual events research.

Table 1. Number of Articles Per Year

<i>Year</i>	<i>1990</i>	<i>1991</i>	<i>1992</i>	<i>1993</i>	<i>1994</i>	<i>1996</i>	<i>1997</i>	<i>1998</i>	<i>2002</i>	<i>2003</i>	<i>Total</i>
N of Articles:	6	6	1	3	2	2	2	1	3	7	33

The most frequently discussed core issue, addressed by 24 individual events articles in the sample, was the educational laboratory of forensics (see Table 2). These articles highlighted individual event pedagogy, judging or ballot criteria, and tournament or event structure. Argumentation as a core issue appeared in three articles, addressing analysis development in rhetorical criticism, the role of argument in oral interpretation, and different types of argumentation in limited preparation events (e.g., Givens, 1994; Koeppel & Morman, 1991; Preston, 1992). Leiboff's 1990 article on the individual events championships at the National Forensics Association tournament, and Kosloski's 1994 discussion of

the role of physically challenged students in individual events did not clearly address one of the core issues identified by Logue and Shea (1990). Skill improvement was discussed in one article (McMillan & Todd-Mancillas' 1991 assessment of student perceptions of the advantages and disadvantages of participation in individual events).

Table 2. Core Issues by Year

<i>Year:</i>	<i>1990</i>	<i>1991</i>	<i>1992</i>	<i>1993</i>	<i>1994</i>	<i>1996</i>	<i>1997</i>	<i>1998</i>	<i>2002</i>	<i>2003</i>	<i>Total</i>
Ed Lab:	5	4	0	3	0	2	2	1	1	6	24
Skills:	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Arg.:	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	3
Other:	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	1	5
Total:	6	6	1	3	2	2	2	1	3	7	33

The content of more than half of the articles in the sample was applicable to individual events in general. Of the seventeen articles with general application to individual events, four addressed ballot or judging criteria, and two discussed the use of questions in individual events competition. The use of ballots to improve speeches, the necessity of source citations, competition history, student perceptions of the value of participation in individual events, and incorporating disabled students into individual events competition were each addressed by other articles. A significant number of articles specifically addressed and were applicable to one particular event. Rhetorical Criticism was the focus of four articles; two addressed the use of judge or competitor questions in the event, one discussed improving argumentation, and one described a pedagogical model of the event (e.g., Givens, 1994; Green & Schnoor, 1990; Ott, 1998; Sellnow & Hanson, 1990). After-Dinner Speaking and Persuasion were addressed in two articles. Impromptu and Extemporaneous Speaking were only addressed in one article. Interpretation events were the focus of five articles (e.g., Koepfel & Morman, 1991; Mills, 1991; Rice, 1991). Only one article focused on limited preparation events in general. None of the individual events articles published between 1990 and 2003 appeared to be applicable to debate, general argumentation, or contexts outside of forensics competition.

Table 3. Generalizability by Year

<i>Year</i>	<i>1990</i>	<i>1991</i>	<i>1992</i>	<i>1993</i>	<i>1994</i>	<i>1996</i>	<i>1997</i>	<i>1998</i>	<i>2002</i>	<i>2003</i>	<i>Total</i>
Ltm. Prep	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Rhet. Crit. Only:	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	4
Intcrp Only:	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	5
Impromptu Only:	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Extemp Only:	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
ADS Only:	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	2
Persuasion Only:	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2
General I.E.	4	2	0	2	1	2	0	0	0	6	17

The vast majority of individual events articles published between 1990 and 1998 used some form of qualitative method. Fifteen of the articles were written as essays, arguing for a viewpoint or advocating a specific practice within individual events. For example, two articles in the Fall 1990 issue of the *NFJ* are published as responses to a previous article on the use of questions in rhetorical criticism (Green & Schnoor, 1990; Sellnow & Hanson, 1990). Although neither article uses a specific research method, both use reasoning and evidence to argue their position on the issue. In contrast, seven articles also were qualitative in nature, but used a content analysis of ballots, survey responses or interviews to draw conclusions. All but one of the articles utilizing content analysis were analyzing judge or ballot criteria in competition; the other article studied student opinions on the use of questions in individual events rounds (Mills & Pettus, 1993). Nine articles used a quantitative research methodology. All of the quantitative individual events articles used surveys to investigate their subject matter. Two individual events article were informative. For example, Leiboff's (1990) article presented cumulative team and individual results from the National Forensic Association's twenty years of hosting a national tournament for individual events.

Table 4. Research Method by Year

<i>Year:</i>	<i>1990</i>	<i>1991</i>	<i>1992</i>	<i>1993</i>	<i>1994</i>	<i>1996</i>	<i>1997</i>	<i>1998</i>	<i>2002</i>	<i>2003</i>	<i>Total</i>
Quantitative:	1	2	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	3	9
Qualitative:	2	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	2	7
Content Anal.											
Qualitative:	2	3	1	2	1	1	0	1	2	2	15
Essay											
Informative:	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to analyze individual events research published in the *National Forensic Journal* between 1990 and 2003 to determine if this body of scholarship met the research agenda set by other scholars. The results appear to indicate the research agenda is not being met, based on the dearth of individual events articles published between 1992 and 2002, an increased focus on competitive practices within the educational laboratory, the limited application of published research within the sample, and the lack of structured individual events research.

Although Porter (1990) and others called for increased research in forensics in the late 1980s, the number of individual events articles published in *NFJ* declined for a decade from 1992 to 2002. The small resurgence in 2003 may be an indicator of a renaissance in individual events research. One year is, however, insufficient to clearly substantiate the claim.

The decline may indicate forensic scholars are focusing less on individual events and more on other issues within the general forensic community. For example, three of the five articles in the Fall/Spring 1998 issue of the *NFJ* focused on implemented service learning into forensic participation. Second, many forensic professionals also oversee debate programs. These scholars may not focus their research solely on individual events, but address issues affecting their programs in general. Third, *NFJ* does not exclusively publish individual events research. At times, the *NFJ* has highlighted research on other activities within forensics. Articles in the Fall 1996 issue were part of a special edition on Lincoln-Douglas debate. Fourth, the decreased number of articles on individual events may be attributed to a lack of submitted research. The *NFJ* was published less frequently in the 1990s as it was in the 1980s. Only one issue was printed in 1993 and 1994, the journal was not printed in 1995, two issues were combined into one published volume in 1998, and no issues were published from 1999-2001. As former *NFJ* editor Halford Ryan (1996) states, "even a journal with a devoted editorial board cannot be published without submissions" (p. iv). If the *NFJ* is to provide a forum for quality individual events scholarship, forensic professionals need to constantly engage in research and the journal must be published with more regularity.

Most of the research within the sample focused on the core issue of forensics as an educational laboratory. However, the articles in this category focused primarily on competitive practices, such the use of judge questions in rounds, the use of specific judging criteria on ballots, and content analyses of judge comments and justifications for decisions. The prevalence of articles on competitive practices may signal they were the "critical issues" facing individual events during this time period. The results indicate the pedagogical priority of current research is centered on how to improve performance in competition and analyzing or critiquing judges, rather than how to educate students and coaches on the theory and practice of individual events. This conclusion is consistent with research by Burnett, Brand and Meister (2001), who argue the metaphor of forensics as an educational laboratory is increasingly becoming "nested" in the "competitive setting" of the activity (p. 102). The need for increased research on the educational aspects of individual events pedagogy is clear, as it can extend the value of forensics scholarship and the activity. Dean (1992) states, "To those who decry forensics as "just a game," pedagogical research verifies the perception in the academic community that forensics does in fact offer solid educational experiences" (p. 30).

The emphasis on competition over education in individual events research is highlighted by the lack of research on skill improvement. Logue and Shea's (1990) survey of individual events research in the 1980s found little literature measuring skill improvement or development. However, they viewed the lack of skill research as a less of shortcoming of forensics research and more of a trend in communication scholarship (Logue & Shea, 1990, p. 23). The importance of articles on skill development is critical, as they provide individual events with a tool to measure the benefits of participation. Worth (2000) states if forensic

research is to be viewed as credible, it must include skill development and the types of success forensic competitors experience after forensic participation in the activity as an area of basic descriptive research (p. 8).

Future research on argumentation in individual events has promise. Only three articles centered on this core issue, yet each demonstrated its applicability to different areas by discussing its use in oral interpretation, public address and limited preparation events. Research on argumentation has not been done as frequently or successfully in individual events as it has been done in debate. Harris, Kropp & Rosenthal (1986) state individual events research has just started to claim it rightful theoretical background in argumentation, while "our colleagues in debate have long claimed the fields of argumentation theory as a link for many of their research efforts" (p. 13). Logue and Shea (1990) note argumentation "predominates debate research," though relatively few individual events articles explore and develop argumentative concepts (p. 23). Nevertheless, argumentation in individual events is a research area which can be expanded to make contributions to communication theory.

The potential exists for individual events research to be applied to other contexts. The results indicate the current focus of research is, however, in areas germane only to a specific event, a group of events, or individual events in general. The overall majority of articles centered on topics pertinent to all individual events. The remaining articles tended to focus on a single public address event (e.g., Rhetorical Criticism, After-Dinner Speaking, and Persuasion). Rhetorical Criticism was the most-researched of all the events. None of the articles on oral interpretation discussed a specific event. Overall, the articles on individual events are only applicable to their own area within forensics, not to the forensics community at large or to communication theory. Our findings are consistent with Logue and Shea's (1990) study of individual events research. Logue and Shea (1990) state the lack of application to the forensics community at large and/or to communication theory is an issue the entire forensics community needs to address. "Even within the forensics community, what CEDA writers chose to elaborate on has little value for individual events coaches and vice versa" (Logue & Shea, 1990, p. 24). We concur and reinforce Logue and Shea's (1990) position. Forensics scholarship must find a way to demonstrate broader application to communication discipline.

The majority of articles in the sample advocated a concept or idea but lacked a structured research method. This finding is not necessarily problematic. Klumpp (1990) states the "theoretical essay" is necessary to develop a "vocabulary and posited structure" for future individual events scholarship (82). However, even when researchers branch out into more structured research, individual events scholars tend to limit their methods of study to surveys and content analyses. Based on the results of our research, forensic coaches have not heeded the calls from Porter (1990), Worth (2000), and Logue and Shea (1990) for historical, descriptive, and further experimental research on individual events.

Finally, we believe the general decline in the quantity of forensic scholarship is a result of specific trends occurring within the activity. First, the activity

has experienced a significant decline in the number of tenure-track appointments for forensic directors/scholars. Every year previously tenure-track positions are converted to fixed-term status. This has a curtailing factor in forensic research. Tenure-track faculties are traditionally expected to have an ongoing research agenda, while fixed-term faculties rarely have the same research expectations. Tenure-track/tenured faculties are more likely to hold terminal degrees with the depth of research methods such degrees provide. Fixed-term faculty tends to hold master's-level degrees. A master's degree will have coursework in research methods, but rarely to the depth and breadth of someone holding a terminal degree. The result is a drifting within the activity toward forensic-faculty who are not expected to research and have less background in conducting research. A second issue is the slow demise of doctoral-granting institutions with forensic programs. Many doctoral programs have dropped individual-events participation from their institution (e.g., University of Minnesota) or have turned their forensics programs over to fixed-term faculty and/or graduate students. The result is a dearth of forensic scholarship mentoring occurring at doctoral institutions. For example, one forensics program at a Midwestern university was for decades under the direction of a tenure-track/tenured Ph.D. faculty. During this time span, the university turned out a significant number of doctors who were involved in forensics and generated sound forensic scholarship. However, with the departure of the tenured director in the mid-1990s, the program was turned over a fixed-term faculty member. Since then, the number of doctoral candidates involved in forensics and generating forensic scholarship has been significantly reduced. The fixed-term faculties were interested in competition, not forensic scholarship, and had little impetus to mentor graduate students in the fine points of forensic scholarship. Finally, the contemporary nature of individual events tournaments has placed significant time demands on practicing forensic professionals. The lengthening of the forensic season, the advent of the swing tournament, and the demands of national qualification has stretched the forensic professional to the extremes. Under such a daunting schedule, something must give—and research is the most likely victim, (see Cronn-Mills & Cronn-Mills, 1997, for further discussion and implication of these trends.)

Limitations and Areas for Future Research

The findings of our study have one primary limitation. First, conclusions are drawn by examining individual events research in one of several forensic-related journals. We do not include any research published in other journals or papers on individual events presented at state, regional or national conventions. Thus, the findings presented are only a snapshot of research trends apparent from one outlet for research (*NFJ*) at a particular time (1990-2003). Further study of research trends in individual events should include a more longitudinal approach by studying scholarship over a longer period of time and should take other avenues for publishing or presenting research into account.

Forensic scholars rely too heavily on surveys and content analysis to conduct their research. Surveys and content analysis are fine research tools, but

their inherent limitations are restricting our insight of intercollegiate forensics. Researchers should use a variety of methods to explore the issues in individual events. Our discipline has a vast array of research methods available for illuminating communication practices and principles. Forensic scholars can take greater advantage of the full the vast amounts of data at our disposal by utilizing a broader range of methods such as in-depth interviews, focus groups, participant observation, ethnography, phenomenology, ethnomethodology, symbolic interactionism, chaos theory/nonlinear dynamics, hermeneutics, historical/critical, experimental, quasi-experimental, case studies, laboratory experiments, process studies, comparative analysis, implementation evaluation, and evaluability assessments. We call for forensic scholars to return to their "graduate-school roots" and re-explore and utilize the full range of research methods at our disposal.

We offer four areas where communication scholarship may head in the 21st century. First, forensic scholars should develop, incorporate, evaluate, and implement assessment standards into individual event practices. Assessment is a "linchpin" for contemporary higher education accreditation; and since forensics is an extension of the classroom, the development of appropriate assessment standards and processes is a natural area for expanding the forensic research agenda. Assessment standards (e.g., student learning outcomes) should be developed for each individual event. The assessment standards may help to define the unique characteristics, parameters, and assumptions for each event.

Second, forensic research should expand beyond the competitive tournament arena and address issues on a larger holistic scale. For example, focus groups or in-depth interviews may be conducted with former competitors, coaches, judges, and administrators to ascertain the facets of forensics which most influenced their professional lives; studies may be conducted to determine the influence of forensics on students' grades, career choices, lifestyles, and hobbies and activities; research could ascertain the impact of forensic involvement on personal and private lives including relationships with partners and children.

Third, future research on individual events should take advantage of areas suggested by Porter (1990), Worth (2000), Klumpp (1990), and Logue and Shea (1990) to improve the quality and utility of forensic scholarship. Researchers should investigate the educational aspect of individual events to create pedagogy with stronger links to communication theory. Many informally argue (and many disciplinary scholars have come to believe) forensics operates in a vacuum which separates the activity from the rest of the discipline. Studies could substantiate, extend, and integrate communication theory into the core practices of the individual events curriculum.

Finally, scholarship should use the forensic environment for research into non-forensic directed research. Allow us to explain. A forensics program is a relatively stable and controlled environment for studies of small group, conflict-management, gender, interpersonal development, leadership development, instructional development, nonverbal communication, intercultural communication, and

many other theoretical areas with the communication discipline. A forensic program provides a cadre of stable subjects for participation in any number of communication research projects. A forensic program also provides subjects for one of the more difficult research aspects in studying communication—longitudinal studies. Most students are involved in a program for eight to nine months of the academic year, and many will stay involved for years with their forensics program. Such a stable, highly interactive (and willing) data pool would be very difficult to replicate in most departments, and yet forensics programs provide such an opportunity as a routine part of their very nature.

Our study explores trends in research on individual events published in the *National Forensic Journal* from 1990-2003. Little has changed since Logue and Shea's (1990) study, yet the areas for developing forensic research retain their potential to enhance the stature of the activity within the larger academic community.

References

- Aden, R. C. (1990). The value of forensics research: The director of forensics' view. *National Forensic Journal, 8*, 57-60.
- Burnett, A., Brand, J. & Meister, M. (2001). Forensics education? How the structure and discourse of forensics promotes competition. *Argumentation and Advocacy, 38*, 106-114.
- Cronn-Mills, D., & Cronn-Mills, K. (1997). Institutional circuit rider is the future of the DOF. *Southern Journal of Forensic, 2*, 248-251.
- Dean, K. W. (1992). Encouraging forensics pedagogy. *National Forensic Journal, 8*, 29-36.
- Friedley, S. A. (1992). Forensics as a laboratory experience in interpersonal communication. *National Forensic Journal, 10*, 51-56.
- Givens, A. (1994). Fostering greater analysis in rhetorical criticism: A re-examination of Whatley's views on rhetoric. *National Forensic Journal, 11*, 29-36.
- Green, K. D., & Schnoor, L. (1990). The question in rhetorical criticism: A response to Levasseur and Dean. *National Forensic Journal, 8*, 195-198.
- Harris, E. J, Kropp Jr., R. P. & Rosenthal, R. E. (1986). The tournament as laboratory: Implications for forensic research. *National Forensic Journal, 4*, 13-22.
- Kay, J. (1990). Research and scholarship in forensics as viewed by an administrator and former coach. *National Forensic Journal, 8*, 61-68.
- Klumpp, J. F. (1990). Wading into the stream of forensics research: A view from the editorial office. *National Forensic Journal, 8*, 77-86.
- Koeppel, L.B. & Morman, M. T. (1991). Oral interpretation events and argument: Forensic discourse or aesthetic entertainment? *National Forensic Journal, 9*, 141-154.
- Kosloski, D. L. (1994). Considering the role of the physically challenged student in individual events competition. *National Forensic Journal, 11*, 37-40.
- Leiboff, M. D. (1990). I.E. Nationals results: A twentieth anniversary update. *National Forensic Journal, 8*, 217-219.
- Logue, B. & Shea, C. (1990). Individual events research: A review and criticism. *National Forensic Journal, 7*, 17-28.
- Madsen, A. (1990). Graduate students and forensic research. *National Forensic Journal, 8*, 45-49.
- McKerrow, R. E. (1990). Evaluating research in forensics: Considerations of the tenure and promotion process. *National Forensic Journal, 8*, 73-76.
- McMillan, J. K. & Todd-Mancillas, W. R. (1991). An assessment of the value of individual events in forensics competition from students' perspectives. *National Forensic Journal, 9*, 1-17.
- Mills, D. D. (1991). Interpreting the oral interpretation judge: Content analysis of oral interpretation ballots. *National Forensic Journal, 9*, 31-40.
- Mills, D. & Pettus, A. B. (1993). Competitors' perceptions of questions in individual events rounds. *National Forensic Journal, 11*, 1-12.

Ott, B. L. (1998). Bridging scholarly theory and forensics practice: Toward a more pedagogical model of rhetorical criticism. *National Forensic Journal*, 16, 53-74.

Parson, D. W. (1990). On publishing and perishing: Some approaches in forensic research. *National Forensic Journal*, 8, 69-72.

Porter, S. (1990). Forensic research: A call for action. *National Forensic Journal*, 7, 95-104.

Preston, C. T. (1992). Extemporaneous speaking and impromptu speaking: A system for differentiating benefits and practical applications. *National Forensic Journal*, 10, 19-32.

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

Ryan, H. (1996). About this issue. *National Forensic Journal*, 14, iv.

Sellnow, T. L. & Hanson, C. T. (1990). Some questions about questions in contest rhetorical criticism: A response to Levasseur and Dean. *National Forensic Journal*, 8, 189-194.

Swanson, D. R. (1992). Forensics as a laboratory experience in communication studies. *National Forensic Journal*, 10, 49-50.

Worth, D. S. (2000). Exploring the forensics community: The need for stronger basic research. East Lansing, MI: National Center for Research on Teacher Learning. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 448 481).

Ott, B. L. (1998). Bridging scholarly theory and forensics practice: Toward a more pedagogical model of rhetorical criticism. *National Forensic Journal*, 16, 53-74.

Parson, D. W. (1990). On publishing and perishing: Some approaches in forensic research. *National Forensic Journal*, 8, 69-72.

Porter, S. (1990). Forensic research: A call for action. *National Forensic Journal*, 7, 95-104.

Preston, C. T. (1992). Extemporaneous speaking and impromptu speaking: A system for differentiating benefits and practical applications. *National Forensic Journal*, 10, 19-32.

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

Ryan, H. (1996). About this issue. *National Forensic Journal*, 14, iv.

Sellnow, T. L. & Hanson, C. T. (1990). Some questions about questions in contest rhetorical criticism: A response to Levasseur and Dean. *National Forensic Journal*, 8, 189-194.

Swanson, D. R. (1992). Forensics as a laboratory experience in communication studies. *National Forensic Journal*, 10, 49-50.

Worth, D. S. (2000). Exploring the forensics community: The need for stronger basic research. East Lansing, MI: National Center for Research on Teacher Learning. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 448 481).

Editor's Note: There has been some demand for the appendices from the Manchester and Friedley piece published in the Fall, 2003 issue of *NFJ* ('Revisiting Male/Female Participation and Success in Forensics: Has Time Changed the Playing Field?'). Below are the three appendices.

APPENDIX A

National Debate Tournament Results

Male/Female Levels of Participation and Success

Data Summary

	1984		2001	
<i>Preliminary Rounds</i>	<u>62</u> Teams	M/M = 45 Teams (73%) M/F = 15 Teams (24%) F/F = 2 Teams (3%) $\chi^2 = 47.55, p < .01$	<u>77</u> Teams	M/M = 43 Teams (56%) M/F = 29 Teams (38%) F/F = 5 Teams (6%) $\chi^2 = 29.08, p < .01$
<i>Octa Finals</i>	<u>16</u> Teams	M/M = 13 Teams (81%) M/F = 2 Teams (13%) F/F = 1 Team (6%) $\chi^2 = 6.17, p < .05$	<u>16</u> Teams	M/M = 11 Teams (69%) M/F = 5 Teams (31%) F/F = 0 Teams (0%) $\chi^2 = 6.65, p < .05$

<i>Quarter Finals</i>	8 Teams	M/M = 7 Teams (88%) M/F = 1 Team (12%) F/F = 0 Teams (0%) $\chi^2 = 1.1$	<u>8</u> Teams	M/M = 5 Teams (67%) M/F = 3 Teams (33%) F/F = 0 Teams (0%) $\chi^2 = 0.56$
<i>Semi Finals</i>	4 Teams	M/M = 3 Teams (75%) M/F = 1 Team (25%) F/F = 0 Teams (0%)	<u>4</u> Teams	M/M = 4 Teams (100%) M/F = 0 Teams (0%) F/F = 0 Teams (0%)
<i>Finals</i>	2 Teams	M/M = 1 Team (50%) M/F = 1 Team (50%) F/F = 0 Teams (0%)	<u>2</u> Teams	M/M = 2 Teams (100%) M/F = 0 Teams (0%) F/F = 0 Teams (0%)

APPENDIX B

AFA – NIET Tournament Results
Male/Female Levels of Participation and Success
Data Summary

	1984			2001		
	N	M	F	N	M	F
Overall Participants						
Preliminary Rounds	861	499 (58%)	362 (42%)			$\chi^2=21.80, p<.01$
Quarter Finals	265	172 (65%)	93 (35%)	1441	749 (52%)	692 (48%) $\chi^2= 2.26$
Semi Finals	132	94 (71%)	38 (29%)	290	168 (58%)	122 (42%) $\chi^2= 2.69$
Finals	66	53 (80%)	13 (20%)	144	94 (65%)	50 (35%) $\chi^2=10.15, p<.01$
				72	47 (65%)	25 (35%) $\chi^2= 5.12, p<.05$
Original Events		M	F		M	F
Preliminary Rounds				471	221 (47%)	250 (53%) $\chi^2= 1.78$
Quarter Finals	257	146 (57%)	111 (43%)	96	46 (48%)	50 (52%) $\chi^2= .04$
Semi Finals	96	56 (58%)	40 (42%)	48	27 (56%)	21 (44%) $\chi^2= .85$
Finals	48	28 (58%)	20 (42%)	24	12 (50%)	12 (50%) $\chi^2= .08$
	24	17 (71%)	7 (29%)			
						$\chi^2= 1.85$
Interpretive Events		M	F		M	F
Preliminary Rounds	437	236 (54%)	201 (46%)	735	382 (52%)	353 (48%) $\chi^2= 1.14$
Quarter Finals	121	86 (71%)	35 (29%)	146	88 (60%)	58 (40%) $\chi^2= 3.95, p<.05$
Semi Finals	60	47 (78%)	13 (22%)	72	51 (71%)	21 (29%) $\chi^2=10.30, p<.01$
Finals	30	25 (83%)	5 (17%)	36	27 (75%)	9 (25%) $\chi^2= 7.66, p<.01$
Limited Prep Events		M	F		M	F
Preliminary Rounds	167	115 (69%)	52 (31%)	235	148 (63%)	87 (37%) $\chi^2=15.84, p<.01$
Quarters Finals	48	30 (63%)	18 (37%)	48	33 (69%)	15 (31%) $\chi^2= .70$
Semi Finals	24	19 (79%)	5 (21%)	24	16 (67%)	8 (33%) $\chi^2= .14$
Finals	12	11 (92%)	1 (8%)	12	8 (67%)	4 (33%) $\chi^2= .06$

APPENDIX C

NFA – IE Nationals Tournament Results
Male/Female Levels of Participation and Success
Data Summary

	1984				2001			
	N	M	F		N	M	F	
<i>Overall Participation</i>								
Preliminary Rounds	2096	1090 (52%)	1006 (48%)	$\chi^2= 3.36$	1587	746 (47%)	841 (53%)	$\chi^2= 5.68, p<.05$
Quarter Finals	241	142 (59%)	99 (41%)	$\chi^2= 4.64, p<.05$	241	137 (57%)	104 (43%)	$\chi^2= 4.90, p<.05$
Semi Finals	120	68 (57%)	52 (43%)	$\chi^2= 1.04$	120	70 (58%)	50 (42%)	$\chi^2= 6.19, p<.05$
Finals	60	35 (58%)	25 (42%)	$\chi^2= 1.26$	60	37 (62%)	23 (38%)	$\chi^2= 5.19, p<.05$
<i>Original Events</i>								
Preliminary Rounds	738	376 (51%)	362 (49%)	$\chi^2= .26$	582	274 (47%)	308 (53%)	$\chi^2= 1.98$
Quarter Finals	96	49 (51%)	47 (49%)	$\chi^2= 0$	97	44 (45%)	53 (55%)	$\chi^2= .11$
Semi Finals	48	25 (52%)	23 (48%)	$\chi^2= .76$	48	21 (44%)	27 (56%)	$\chi^2= .21$
Finals	24	11 (46%)	13 (54%)	$\chi^2= .26$	24	13 (54%)	11 (46%)	$\chi^2= .49$
<i>Interpretive Events</i>								
Preliminary Rounds	971	476 (49%)	495 (51%)	$\chi^2= .38$	682	286 (42%)	396 (58%)	$\chi^2=17.74, p<.01$
Quarter Finals	97	59 (61%)	38 (39%)	$\chi^2= 5.45, p<.05$	96	55 (57%)	41 (43%)	$\chi^2= 9.24, p<.01$
Semi Finals	48	27 (56%)	21 (44%)	$\chi^2= 1.02$	48	31 (65%)	17 (35%)	$\chi^2= 9.97, p<.01$
Finals	24	15 (62%)	9 (38%)	$\chi^2= 1.71$	24	14 (58%)	10 (42%)	$\chi^2= 2.60$
<i>Limited Prep Events</i>								
Preliminary Rounds	387	240 (62%)	147 (38%)	$\chi^2=22.34, p<.01$	333	203 (61%)	130 (39%)	$\chi^2=16.00, p<.01$
Quarter Finals	48	33 (69%)	15 (31%)	$\chi^2= .90$	48	38 (79%)	10 (21%)	$\chi^2= 6.63, p<.05$
Semi Finals	24	16 (67%)	8 (33%)	$\chi^2= .21$	24	18 (75%)	6 (25%)	$\chi^2= 2.06$
Finals	12	9 (75%)	3 (25%)	$\chi^2= .91$	12	10 (83%)	2 (17%)	$\chi^2= 2.55$