Editor's Note

> With the issuance of this inaugural edition, it is my hope and my expectation that we have only just begun a journal that will continue long into the future to respond to the ever-changing enterprise of forensics. … This journal reflects the expansion of forensics into fields of individual events as well as the dedicated professionalism of directors of forensics across the country. (Kelley, 1983, p. 63- 64)

These words inaugurated the *National Forensic Journal* in the Spring of 1983. Three decades later they remind a community of its identity, echo a founding purpose, and rearticulate challenges and opportunities inherent in the "ever-changing enterprise of forensics." In 2013, it may be difficult for many who have never known a professional landscape that did not include individual events to fully appreciate the formulation of the idea that individual events competition is worthy of scholarly inquiry. An academic professional journal implies that a profession exists and that it can support and be supported by academic research. As we move into a fourth decade, the evidence for the existence of a forensic enterprise is overwhelming, but the degree to which that enterprise reflects an engaged community of academic scholars is debatable. The *National Forensic Journal* owes its very existence to the belief that forensic education spawns worthwhile scholarship. *NFJ* will continue to perpetuate this heuristic ideal.

To that end, the articles published here engage areas of research and pedagogy central to the appraisal and advancement of forensic education. Cronn-Mills and Croucher begin the process of evaluating the often maligned but rarely studied issue of the breadth of forensic research. Their study serves as a valuable next step in assessing forensic scholarship and as another warning regarding the widening gap between forensic programs and the communication discipline. Duncan revives "the old man eloquent" and places Isocrates at his rightful place—the philosophical center of contemporary forensic practice. A reconsideration of the philosophy, practice and pedagogy of Ancient Athens' foremost teacher promises to enrich the contemporary forensic enterprise. A close examination of Isocrates' writing, in particular "Against the Sophists," may cause one to see Isocrates' teaching as more of a warning to contemporary forensic practitioners than Duncan's well-articulated defense of forensics. The debate would certainly benefit the forensic community, forcing it to re-examine foundational principles from the past in light of contemporary purposes and practices. Walker and Walker wed contemporary leadership theory with team management practice in an enlightening piece that offers specific, practical direction in developing leaders. With a renewed emphasis in leadership training on campuses across the country, this study provides guidance in placing forensic teams, forensic directors and forensic student leaders at the heart of leadership discussions. Carmack and Holm's study of forensic director burnout focuses on an issue that is vital to the development of the forensic enterprise as a professional enterprise. Burnout and associated issues of physical and mental health diminish the benefits of forensic competition and threaten its professional status. So many professional issues introduced in the Sedalia and Northwestern National Developmental Conferences on Forensics have disappeared from view. Carmack and Holm serve the profession well by visiting the problem of burnout.

Another decade of forensic scholarly engagement begins. Thank you, authors and reviewers, for your contributions. Special thanks to Dr. Bruce Wickelgren, previous *NFJ* editor, and Dr. Michael Dreher, *NFA* webmaster, for their numerous contributions to the "ever-changing enterprise of forensics." Also, special thanks to Amber Chiang, Bakersfield, for additional editorial review of these manuscripts.

Randy Richardson
Co-Editor

The "Carousel Effect" in Forensic Research

Daniel Cronn-Mills
Minnesota State University, Mankato

Stephen M. Croucher
University of Jyväskylä

Our purpose is to determine if an anecdotal pattern we have seen emerging at the National Communication Association (NCA) conference holds true. We have noticed that forensic panels at NCA, and specifically individual events (IE) panels, appear to revolve around similar themes. Scholars interested in IE issues may be repeating themselves. The result is a "carousel effect": the papers/panels go round'n'round the same ideas. Our analysis identified two findings: (1) 25 research themes are evident in forensics and three themes comprise the focus of most of the research; (2) qualitative analysis showed repetition among the titles of forensic research. We argue the carousel effect has long-term implications for the forensic community and may prove damaging if not addressed.

Disciplinary conferences serve many purposes for the membership. One may attend sessions to learn new teaching strategies, to re-unite with colleagues, to share ideas and concerns at roundtable forums, or to present research papers for review. Conferences serve to guide a discipline as members investigate new ideas, concepts, issues, and theories. A key component of a communication conference is the opportunity to present research papers for review by peers before submitting the work to peer-reviewed journals. Comments from a respondent and the audience may provide significant insight for strengthening the paper before journal submission.

Our purpose is to determine if an anecdotal pattern we have seen emerging at the National Communication Association (NCA) conference holds true. We have noticed forensic panels at NCA, and specifically individual events (IE) panels, appear to revolve around similar themes. Thus, panels on very similar topics appear to routinely show up in the NCA conference program. Scholars interested in IE issues may be repeating themselves and not using disciplinary conferences to move their area of the communication discipline forward. The result is a "carousel effect": the papers and panels go round'n'round the same ideas, and when they stop, nobody knows. The result is IE research may suffer. Scholars may not be improving IE research, may not be improving the activity nor improving the standing of individual events within the discipline. Rather, scholars may simply be covering the same ground again and again.

Logue and Shea (1990) pointed out, "periodically, it is a wise idea to examine what a field has been producing in terms of its research and scholarship" (p. 17). Forensic scholars have routinely engaged in reviews of published research (Croucher, 2006; Hample, 1981; Herbeck, 1990; Kay, 1990; Kerber & Cronn-Mills, 2005; Klumpp, 1990; Logue & Shea, 1989; Logue & Shea, 1990; McGlone, 1969; Ryan, 1998; Thomas, 1983; Walwick, 1969).

Research is necessary for forensics to be fully accepted into a professional community of scholars. McBath (1975) argued more than three decades ago, "If forensics is to improve its status with colleagues and in other disciplines, it will be through heightened emphasis on research and scholarship" (p. 34). Research is the core of higher education and provides the foundation for what we teach. Research, in fact, should provide the foundation for all we do in forensics.

Aden (1990) identified three reasons for conducting forensic research. First, forensic research provides a common ground for understanding the various events offered in intercollegiate competitive forensics. Aden acknowledged most institutions provide, at most, one course in forensic pedagogy, aimed at training scholars in forensics. Second, forensic research provides an opportunity for students to expand their understanding of forensics beyond the limited comments provided on competitive ballots. Third, forensic research provides the critical link between theory and practice for forensic professionals and students.

Our review of the literature unfortunately reveals forensics, especially individual events, has suffered a deficiency in scholarly production for an extensive period. The 1974 Sedalia Conference, the first national gathering to focus on forensics, addressed the issue of research. As Parson (1990) noted, "the conference clearly created a call to research in forensics" (p. 69). For more than a decade journal editors have publicly addressed the deficiencies in forensic research. Geisler (1993) noted "the associate editors have found a dearth of suitable material for publication in this journal [*National Forensic Journal]"* (p. 59). Ryan (1998) faced the problem of the lack of submissions: "A basic fact of a journal's life is that the editor cannot publish essays that are not submitted" (p. 77), and Croucher (2006) highlighted a lack of theoretical density and rigor in forensic research. Croucher contended, "from a communication theory point of view … forensics research leaves much to be desired" (p. 1).

Herbeck (1990), Bickford (1990), Kay (1990), and Aden (1991) agreed forensics research needs improvement. The most significant problem, however, may be simply neglect. Harris, Kropp, and Rosenthal (1986) asserted forensics professionals tend to focus time and effort on forensics pedagogy (e.g., coaching and competition) and neglect the research opportunities the activity provides.

Forensic professionals are not devoid of scholarly involvement. The number of sessions at NCA available for forensic research is staggering, especially when compared to other interest areas. According to the 2008 Convention Planners' Packet (Bach, 2008), forensic organizations had more than 50 sessions available for scheduling. (A listing from 2005-2008 is provided in Table 1.) Few other interest areas come even close to the number of sessions available to forensic scholars. We contend more than 50 sessions should be considered a considerable amount of time devoted to forensic scholarship. In theory such an impressive array of conference sessions has the potential to produce an equally impressive array of quality journal publications. Our research revealed, however, the significant number of conference presentations does not logically correspond to the limited number of journal submissions and published journal articles.

McKerrow (1990) identified a specific question to ask of conference papers: "Are papers presented at regional and national conventions moved through the process toward publication? While not a prerequisite for every paper presented, the record should reflect a general movement toward publication, whereby convention presentations represent an

initial step" (p. 74). The considerable disparity between the number of presentations at NCA (and other conferences) and the dismal number of manuscript submissions to journals require us to answer McKerrow's question with a resounding "No." No, papers are not moving from conference presentation to peer-reviewed journal publication.

Table 1
Sessions/Slots for Programming at NCA from 2005-2008

Organization	2005	2006	2007	2008
Argumentation and Forensics Division	18	15	16	16
American Forensic Association	25	25	18	18
International Forensics Association	2	2	2	2
NFHSSDTA*	4	4	3	3
National Forensic Association	8	7	7	7
Phi Rho Pi	2	2	2	2
Pi Kappa Delta	5	5	5	5
Total	64	60	53	53

*National Federation of High School Speech, Debate & Theatre Association

One of the major hurdles forensic researchers face is the task of writing an effective literature review. A sound literature review is central to almost all research endeavors. A literature review demonstrates the relationship between the current research effort and previous works. Sound research does not materialize from thin air but is built on a sound framework provided by other scholars. As Feeley (2008) argued, "for knowledge to advance, one must access and build upon published research in a given area of scholarship" (p. 505).

A dilemma confronting forensic professionals is access to the scholarship relevant to their research interests. However, if the majority of manuscripts are conference papers and the papers are not readily available for review, then the scholarship will face significant difficulties building on previous work and advancing the activity. Such a significant roadblock can quickly cripple a promising research inquiry.

Our goal is to assess the scope of forensics research. Our focus is on forensics research as a whole and scholarship presented at NCA from 1998 to 2007. We pose the following research questions:

RQ1: What themes are present in forensics research?
RQ2: To what extent are the themes in forensics research repetitive?

METHOD

A content analysis was chosen as the methodological approach for two reasons. First, content analysis affords the opportunity to study archived papers and panel presentations as the unit of analysis. Second, content analysis includes the use of manifest content to determine content, which may provide insight into themes.

Forensics Research Papers and Presentations

Titles of papers and panel discussions submitted to one of the seven forensics-related divisions (i.e., Argumentation and Forensics, American Forensics Association, International Forensics Association, National Federation of High School Speech, Debate & Theatre Association, National Forensics Association, Phi Rho Pi, and Pi Kappa Delta) at the National Communication Association were selected as the data source. Such papers and panel discussions serve as a major component of the tenure and promotion process, the socialization of academics, and as a major aspect of forensics pedagogy. Titles of papers and panel discussions were chosen instead of entire manuscripts for the three reasons. First, a significant number of forensic papers are submitted to NCA as part of panels, not as competitive papers. Second, more than 60 percent of the forensics research presented at NCA since 1998 is not available through any NCA database or search engine. Either NCA did not collect and save the papers for post-conference distribution or the authors did not provide a completed copy of the paper to NCA. The limited number of available papers severely hinders any attempt at a systematic analysis of complete manuscripts. Third, to address the full depth of forensic engagement at NCA, we were compelled to include roundtable discussions, town hall debates, and similar spur-of-the-moment presentations. The titles for papers and panel discussions provided simply the most reliable and complete set of data available for investigating a potential "carousel effect" in forensic research. The titles were identified using printed versions of the official NCA program.

Sampling, Coding, and Analysis

A total of 424 paper and panel titles were identified for analysis. Once the paper and panels were compiled, one research team coded the data and generated framing devices. The primary research team then discussed the codes and clarified any questions with a separate research team. Each research team coded the papers and panel presentations, and intercoder reliability was calculated ($\kappa = .89$; Babbie, 2004). Framing devices were defined as the title of a paper or the title of a roundtable panel. Each framing device was inductively coded into a particular theme based on the overall purpose of the title. A framing device was determined if a paper title or roundtable panel mentioned a particular focus. Coders were instructed to add up the number of framing devices for each particular theme.

To explore *RQ1*, the frequencies of framing devices were analyzed to determine the overall themes present in forensics research during the past 10 years. A Chi^2 analysis was then conducted to determine if a significant difference existed between the frequencies of the themes. To answer *RQ2*, the researchers conducted a qualitative, deductive analysis of the themes during the 10-year period, paying particular attention to repetitive titles.

Table 2

Forensic Research Themes by Year

THEME	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	TOTAL
Activism/Service Learning	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	7
Criticisms of Forensics	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	4
Argumentative Theory	2	4	3	4	4	3	3	8	3	5	39
Communication Theory	1	0	3	0	4	3	1	0	1	0	13
Debate Pedagogy	2	2	2	3	1	2	1	1	1	2	17
Ethics & Etiquette in Forensics	1	1	1	1	0	2	3	1	0	2	12
Family, Forensics & Wellness	0	1	1	3	0	0	1	3	0	1	10
Forensics & Technology	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	5
Gender/Minorities in Forensics	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	2	0	7
General Debate	1	2	4	7	6	8	4	8	8	8	56
General Forensics	8	4	4	14	18	14	5	17	6	10	100
General Pedagogy	1	2	1	2	1	1	2	0	1	1	12
General Rhetoric	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
History/Future of Rhetoric	4	7	2	3	0	2	3	2	1	0	24
High School/Mock Trial	3	1	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	9
Interpretation Pedagogy	1	0	2	0	4	0	0	0	2	0	9
Judging Forensics	0	1	1	1	2	0	1	1	1	1	9
Limited Prep Pedagogy	1	0	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	5
Public Address Pedagogy	1	1	0	2	1	0	2	0	0	0	7
Personal Experiences	0	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	4
Political Communication	1	3	1	4	2	5	3	3	2	2	26
Regionalism	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	4
Research on Forensics	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	4
Rhetoric of Public Sphere	3	0	0	6	1	1	3	6	3	2	25
Team Administration	2	2	1	1	6	1	1	0	2	2	18

RESULTS

Based on the analysis, 25 themes emerged from forensics research during the years 1998-2007 (*RQ1*). Table 2 shows the themes and the number of papers and panels for each theme. A significant difference emerged between the themes: $\chi^2 = 634.25$, *p* < .0001. Of the 25 themes, the three most common themes in forensics research were: "General Forensics" (*n=100*), "General Debate" (*n=56*), and "Argumentative Theory" (*n* = 39). "General Forensics" included papers and panels on a wide range of forensics- related topics that did not fit into a more specific thematic frame, including what is a comprehensive program; outside looking in on forensics; contextualizing forensics theory; the impact of constitutional revisions on forensics; purpose and value in forensics; and student-run programs. "General Debate" included papers and panels on issues specifically dealing with issues related to intercollegiate debate. Specifically, the papers included such topics as impact of parliamentary debate on teachers and students; use of evidence in debate; debate and citizenship; how to communicate outside debate rounds; and critical issues in debate. "Argumentative Theory" included a wide array of papers broadly on argumentation. Papers topics covered fallacies in arguments; the role of argument in society; patriotism and argumentation; and historical argumentative theory.

For *RQ2*, titles within the 25 themes were analyzed. The analysis looked specifically at whether titles were similar during the course of the 10-year period. The analysis revealed that many themes of forensics research presented at an NCA convention appeared to repeat themselves. Four examples of repetition were revealed. First, during the period of analysis, four very similar titles were presented at the NCA convention on how to coach interpretation events, particularly Program of Oral Interpretation.[1] Second, five papers were written by different individuals during the 10-year period on how to effectively manage a forensics team's budget. Third, 12 to 15 different analyses described how competing in forensics (speech and debate) impacted individuals' lives after completion of the activity.[2] These personal experience pieces (excluding panels) focused on what individuals gained from forensics. Fourth, three to five analyses focused on how to advance or approach topicality arguments in debate (Lincoln Douglas and/or Cross-Examination). We are not arguing these papers all make the same arguments. However, it is impossible to ignore the stark similarities in the titles of these papers.

The content analysis revealed two key findings. First, the quantitative content analysis demonstrated there are 25 general themes in forensics research presented at the NCA convention over the past 10 years (*RQ1*). Of these 25 themes, the three most represented at NCA have been "General Forensics," "General Debate," and "Argumentative Theory." Second, the qualitative content analysis showed repetition among the titles of forensics papers presented (*RQ2*). During the 10-year period, many titles appeared repetitious on a variety of forensics-related subjects.

---

[1] Specific titles of papers are not presented in the analysis, as we do not wish to single out or accuse specific authors of repeating research.

[2] This number is between 12 to 15 because some of the analyses focus on personal experiences and a secondary issue in the title.

DISCUSSION

We fear a trend Swanson predicted in 1992 is becoming increasingly dominant. Swanson (1992b) argued intercollegiate forensics is isolating itself from the curriculum of the communication discipline. Research is the central component of any curriculum. Research is the binding force for a discipline and its sub-disciplines. Conference papers, which go round'n'round without moving the activity forward, and do not, in general, move toward publication limit the role, influence, importance, and relevance of individual events within the communication discipline. Forensic professionals must grasp the long-term implications of the drought of current published research. Forensics runs the risk of becoming a second-class citizen within the communication studies discipline. Published research is the means by which forensic professionals demonstrate their contributions to the discipline. Ryan (1988) issued a warning to forensic professionals: "Scholarly writing has always been a requisite for respect in academia. Folks in forensics cannot expect their non-forensic colleagues to take them seriously if they do not take themselves seriously enough to publish" (p. 77). Harris, Kropp, and Rosenthal (1986) extended Ryan's argument claiming "many colleagues feel that we are merely, in the words of Plato, teaching a _knack' which is not worthy of academic treatment" (p. 14).

We also concur with the arguments of McBath (1975): "Because research and scholarship are the foundation from which all specific areas within a field evolve, and because they establish the basis for interrelationships among the areas, a field of study is both as strong and weak as its research and scholarship" (p. 34). Forensic specialists may have become complacent believing conference papers and panels are sufficient to demonstrate involvement in the scholarly expectations of the discipline. However, the lack of availability of papers (and the immediate loss of panel discussions after the session is over) to guide literature reviews impacts the ability of forensic research to substantively move forward with research agendas. Conference papers (and panels, to a degree) provide a *first-level of review* for research ideas; publication is the ultimate goal. Unfortunately, a problem identified by Parson (1990) more than two decades ago still resonates today: "The problem is that we have failed to heed the recommendations of the [1974] Sedalia Conference" (p. 72).

As forensics faculty continue to justify the budgets for programs and faculty lines, the faculty may find themselves having to justify the quality of their research. Administrators are increasingly turning to factors such as journal impact factor (JIF) and article influence as means of evaluating research quality (Feeley, 2008; Levine, 2010). The most-well known social science index of JIF was created by the Institute for Scientific Information (ISI) and is known as the Social Science Citation Index (SSCI) (Feeley & Moon, 2010; Garfield, 2006).[3] Unfortunately, no forensics-related journals are in the SSCI, and little forensics-related research is published in SSCI-indexed journals. The lack of forensic journals and research in prominent indices may prove problematic for professionals basing job-search applications and tenure-promotion files, on forensic-related research. Faculty who leave their work at the conference level and do not submit

---

[3] Journals must apply for membership into the SSCI. The Index has multiple requirements for admission (e.g., number of subscriptions, article influence, number of citations, timeliness of publication). Currently between 30-40 communication-related journals are in the SSCI (Levine, 2010).

research for publication to a journal may have particular difficulties in the publish-or-perish academic world, particularly in tenuous economic times.

The primary limitation of our study is that we were unable to use completed manuscripts as the units of analysis and instead had to use titles of papers and panel presentations. As previously discussed, more than 60 percent of the forensics research presented at the NCA since 1998 is not available in its completed form. For one reason or another, the majority of forensics-related research is not posted to communication databases. Thus, arguments in our analysis were based on titles of papers, which should represent the overall focus of the paper. Future studies of forensics research should collect completed papers and use the text of the papers as the unit of analysis.

A call to the forensic community to engage in the production of published scholarship is, unfortunately, not new (Croucher, 2006; Hample, 1981; Kay, 1990; Kerber & Cronn-Mills, 2005; Klumpp, 1990; Logue & Shea, 1989; Logue & Shea, 1990; McGlone, 1969; Ryan, 1998; Walwick, 1969). Based on the surfeit of papers and panel presentations at NCA every year, the forensic community is not devoid of ideas for research nor retreating from the research process. The shortfall appears to be taking the next steps in the scholarly process and further developing the papers and panel presentations based on commentary from conference respondents and audience members.

An expectation of improvement based on critique from a respondent/judge/audience is highly familiar to the forensic community. Forensic scholars constantly work with their student competitors to review comments and triage the importance/relevancy/necessity of the comments to improve the speech/interpretation/performance. We encourage forensic professionals to apply the same work ethic to scholarship, which they ask a student competitor to apply to a speech/interpretation/performance.

The ability, knowledge, and expertise are readily available in the community to turn forensic scholarship into a bastion of published research. The "call to arms" need just be heard and answered.

REFERENCES

Aden, R. C. (1990). The value of forensics research: The director of forensics' view. *National Forensic Journal, 8*(1), 57-60.

Aden, R. C. (1991). Reconsidering the laboratory metaphor: Forensics as a liberal art. *National Forensic Journal, 9*(2)*,* 97-108.

Babbie, E. R. (2004). *The practice of social research*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Bach, B. W. (2008). *UnCONVENTIONal! 2008 Convention Planners' Packet*. Washington, DC: National Communication Association.

Bickford, D. (1990). Library and archival resources for forensic research. *National Forensic Journal, 8,* 51-56.

Cronn-Mills, D. (2008a). The pitfalls, perils, and promise to increasing forensic research. Paper presented at the National Developmental Conference on Individual Events, Peoria, IL.

Cronn-Mills, D. (2008b). The pitfalls, perils, and promise to increasing forensic research. In D. Cronn-Mills (Ed.), *Published Proceedings of the National Developmental Conference on Individual Events* (pp. 8-11). Mankato, MN.

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

Feeley, T. H. (2008). A bibliometric analysis of communication journals from 2002 to 2005. *Human Communication Research, 34*(3), 505-520.

Feeley, T. H., & Moon, S.-I. (2010). Update on journal impact ratings in communication: 2006-2008. *Communication Research Reports, 27,* 355-364.

Garfield, E. (2006). The history and the meaning of the journal impact factor. *Journal of the American Medical Association, 295*(1)*,* 90-93.

Geisler, D. (1993). Editor's forum: A brief introduction. *National Forensic Journal, 11,* 59-60.

Hample, D. (1981). Forensics research in the 1980s, *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta, 6,* 20-25.

Harris, E. J., Jr., Kropp, R. P., Jr., & Rosenthal, R. E. (1986). The tournament as laboratory: Implications for forensic research. *The National Forensic Journal, 4,* 13-22.

Herbeck, D. (1990). Debate scholarship: A needs assessment. *National Forensic Journal, 8,* 1-15.

Kay, J. (1990). Research and scholarship in forensics as viewed by an administrator and former coach. *National Forensic Journal, 8,* 61-68.

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

Klumpp, J. F. (1990). Wading into the stream of forensics research: The view from the editorial office. *National Forensic Journal, 8*, 77-86.

Levine, T. R. (2010). Rankings and trends in citation patterns of communication journals. *Communication Education, 59,* 41-51.

Logue, B. J., & Shea, B. C. (1989). An examination and criticism of forensic research: The last five years: 1984-1988. In B. E. Gronbeck (Ed.), *Spheres of argument* (pp. 449-456). Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association.

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

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

McGlone, E. L. (1969). Toward improved quantitative research in forensics. *Journal of the American Forensic Association, 6*, 49-54.

McKerrow, R. E. (1990). Evaluating research in forensics: Considerations of the tenure and promotion process. *National Forensic Journal, 8*, 73-76.

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

Ryan, H. (1998). My four years as editor. *National Forensic Journal, 16,* 75-77.

Thomas, D. A. (1983). *Research in forensics from the past five years: Trends, omissions, and recommendations.* East Lansing, MI: National Center for Research on Teacher Learning. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 240 626).

Walwick, T. J. (1969). Research in forensics: An overview. *Journal of the American Forensic Association, 6,* 43-48.

Antidosis for a Forensics Life: An Isocratic Defense of Modern Practices of Competitive Forensics

Aaron Duncan
University of Nebraska-Lincoln

The forensics community is under attack from inside and outside the coaching profession. It is important that we as coaches defend our practices and justify the value of the activity. Despite his prominence in his own time and his influence over the development of rhetoric, the work of Isocrates has not been utilized to craft a defense of forensics. Similar to the situation we face today, Isocrates also had to defend his practices as a teacher of rhetoric. Using his works *Antidosis* and *Against the Sophist*, I attempt to craft a defense for the practices of the modern forensics community.

Isocrates was one of the greatest teachers of rhetoric in ancient Athens and one of the fathers of modern forensics. He lived from 436-338 BC and during that time crafted some of the most powerful and enduring teachings on rhetoric. In 392 BC, Isocrates founded the first permanent institution of liberal arts education. Located near the Lyceum in Athens, his school lasted for more than fifty years, and his students were a who's who of the ancient world (Matsen, Rollinson, & Sousa, 1990). His school would go on to become the most successful school of rhetoric in Athens and one of the most influential in history. Roman historian Velleius Paterculus went "so far as to call him the sole figure of note in the whole history of rhetoric, for in his view, before Isocrates and after his pupils there is nothing of note as far as the art of public speech is concerned" (Mirhady & Too, 2000, p. 204). Isocrates has been dubbed the "foremost speech teacher" of the ancient world (Berquist, 1959).

Isocrates' work has been used by members of the communication discipline as a source of justification for its educational practices and thus provides a potentially rich resource to draw upon to defend the educational practices of the forensics community. Richardson and Richardson (2010) discuss how the teachings of Isocrates provide a model for a modern vision of forensics leadership. Additionally, Isocrates' work has been discussed in the wider communication literature as a model for teaching rhetoric and civic education (Benoit, 1984; Depew & Poulakos, 2004). However, his work has not been used to defend the educational practices of forensics. Yet Isocrates can be used as a basis to defend forensics for two reasons. First, as previously discussed, he was one of the world's greatest speech teachers and his practices for teaching speech are similar to those used by modern coaches. Second, Isocrates' work centered on his defense of himself as a teacher of rhetoric and public speaking. His two most famous works, *Antidosis* and *Against the Sophists,* centered on his desires to defend his teaching of rhetoric and to distinguish his work from the less reputable work of the Sophists. The goal of this paper, then, is to use the writings of Isocrates, in particular these two works, to defend modern competitive forensics against those who critique the activity.

As an activity and practice, modern forensics faces numerous challenges. Modern forensics is accused of being anti-educational, or subjected to questions about the educational and ethical practices of the activity (Billings, 2002; Burnett, Brand, & Meister, 2003; Cronn-Mills & Schnoor, 2003; Gaer, 2002; Kelly & Richardson, 2008; Richardson & Richardson, 2010; Thomas & Hart, 1983). Historically, forensics programs have faced challenges to justify their budgetary expenditures (Kirch, 2005; Mills, Pettus, & Dickmeyer, 1993; Newell, 2009), a problem which has been exacerbated by the shrinking college and university budgets and a desire to cut back on extracurricular activities (Newell, 2009). Now more than ever it is important for forensics educators to be able to defend the core of the activity and its modern practices. Furthermore, it is necessary for forensic educators to couch their arguments not only in practical defenses of the activity, but also in philosophical and scholarly terms. When defending ourselves to members of the communication community, administrators, parents, and state legislators, we would be well served to draw upon modern and ancient scholarly literature when crafting our arguments. Utilizing classical rhetorical sources as a resource for rhetorical invention and extension provides the user with additional ethos and logos. To this end, the work of the great rhetorician Isocrates can be used to defend the practices of the modern forensics educator.

To understand Isocrates' arguments in *Antidosis*, one must understand the context in which it was written. In ancient Athens, wealthy citizens could be subject to liturgies, which were forms of taxation requiring them to use their money for the public good. The goal of this system was to ensure that the wealthy used their money not only to benefit themselves but also the community. If their civic pride was found to be lacking, then a liturgy could be brought against them. In 356, an Athenian by the name of Megacliedes was charged to pay for the building of a trireme, Hellenistic-style battleship. Megacliedes refused to pay the tax, instead arguing that the rhetorician Isocrates ought to be liable because he was a wealthier man. Ironically, Isocrates himself was not a great public speaker, and he lost the trial. However, the trial became the pretext for the writing of *Antidosis*, a fictional defense of the author's life and work. In *Antidosis*, the fictional prosecutor Lysimachus brings the elderly rhetorician to court on charges that "he corrupted the young of Athens through his teaching and has taught them how to argue unjustly" (Mirhady & Too, 2000, p. 202).

The charges brought against Isocrates in *Antidosis* are not altogether different than those brought against the modern director of a speech and debate team. Isocrates was accused of corrupting the youth by teaching them unethical practices in an effort to attract as many students as possible and gain the material rewards of wealth. Critics of competitive forensics have charged members of the community with corrupting modern students by teaching them unethical practices aimed at competitive, rather than educational, success, and with the goal of gaining the material rewards of trophies (Billings, 2002; Burnett, et al., 2003; Kelly & Richardson, 2008). The term "antidosis" can be literally translated to mean "an exchange." Instead, the term may be used in the same way Isocrates did, translating to mean "a defense." What follows is an antidosis for the modern forensics coach, a defense of lifetimes spent competing and coaching forensics.

Classical Rhetoric and Modern Forensics

In *Antidosis*, Isocrates uses a fictional pretense to bring to life a real conflict. He creates the fictional prosecutor Lysimachus as an embodiment for all the critiques hurled against his work. Borrowing upon this technique of rhetorical invention, picture Isocrates not as an ancient Athenian teacher of rhetoric, but as a modern forensics coach and professor of communication. Furthermore, think not of Lysimachus as a legal prosecutor, but rather as a modern administrator who seeks to cut Isocrates the forensic coach's budget and abolish his team. In crafting Lysimachus' charges against the modern Isocrates, I draw upon relevant forensics literature on this subject, formal discussions on the subject held at national and developmental conferences, and informal discussions and critiques of the activity that I have either heard in person or read on the Individual Events Listserv (IE-L). I believe that Lysimachus would proffer four significant critiques against competitive forensics: 1) Forensics is focused on competitive goals and not educational goals; 2) Forensics teaches rhetorical convention rather than invention (this would include practices like the conventional speech structures, such as problem-cause-solution); 3) Forensics fails to teach students "real world" skills and abilities (for example, forcing students to memorize speeches is often critiqued as not being "real world"); 4) Forensics corrupts today's youth by teaching student values and traditions not in line with ethical reasoning and thinking.

 1) Forensics is Competitive and Not Educational

One of the most often heard criticisms of forensics, and one that a modern Lysimachus would no doubt make, is that the emphasis it places on competition takes away from its educational values (Burnett, et al., 2003; Gaer, 2002; Kelly & Richardson, 2008; Richardson & Richardson, 2010). While neither Isocrates nor his students participated in competitive forensics, in *Antidosis* Isocrates is made to answer for his wealth and, specifically, for the practice of charging students for his teachings. These situations are similar, and Isocrates' defense of the material rewards he received in the form of money can be used to defend the material rewards received by students and coaches in the form of trophies.
  Isocrates was not afraid to receive rewards for his teaching. While individuals like Plato saw this as unethical, Isocrates did not. He argued that if no one was willing to pay for his services, then what would it say about his abilities? He did not shrink from the claim that he received payment for his services. He stated, "I think everyone must know that the sophist's fee is the finest and greatest when some of his pupils become intelligent gentlemen (*kalio kagathoi*) and are honored by the citizens" (p. 245-6). Isocrates' view on this subject is a very modern view of education and business. This is a defendable position. Isocrates provided a service, a very valuable one at that; it seems logical that he should get paid for doing so. Charging for services is much more defendable than the Sophists. As Isocrates noted in *Against the Sophists*, the other Sophists make false claims. He wrote:
   They have no concern for the truth but think that their art (*techne*) consists
   of attracting as many students as possible… They themselves are so
   senseless--and they assume others are as well--that they write speeches

> that are worse than private citizens might improvise, and they promise to
> make their students such good orators that they will miss none of the
> possibility of their case. (Mirhady & Too, 2000, p. 63).

Isocrates provides a valuable service and does not promise any quick fixes or unrealistic claims, and therefore contends it is not unreasonable to think he should receive compensation for his services.

A modern Isocrates would likely defend the practice of receiving trophies for competition as a reward for a service or performance worthy of accolade. Furthermore, one doubts that Isocrates would accept the assumption that competition and education are mutually exclusive. Based on his own experiences competing and teaching students to compete in the legal and political arenas of ancient Greece, it seems likely that he would agree with Hinck's (2003) view that competition has intrinsic educational benefits. However, not knowing his precise take on these arguments, we must look for clues in his writing. We do know that Isocrates argued the rewards he received for his teachings were justified because they were freely given to him as recognition from others, as are the trophies students receive at tournaments. Isocrates believed the payment he received was proof of the value of his teaching and also an incentive to become and stay a good teacher. In much the same way, trophies can act as an external form of motivation for students and coaches.

When modern Lysimachuses charge that forensics is more concerned with competition than education, they are arguing that we as coaches are in truth Sophists. Burnett et al. (2003) made this argument when distinguishing between "coaches" and "teachers." Richardson and Richardson (2010) stated, "Forensics professionals are much more keenly aware of how to win, than we are of how, or even what, we should be teaching" (p. 123). They argue that much like the Sophists, we are aware of how to coach students to win, but we are not teaching in all the ways we should be. However, Isocrates would defend us as educators and not as practitioners of sophistry. First, forensics as an   activity does not promise quick fixes or make unreasonable claims. The internet is filled with modern sophists promising to teach aspiring students to "win any argument." The internet bookstore Amazon.com lists six different books by different authors, all with some version of the title, *How to Win Any Argument*. One can only assume that the similarity of titles is demonstrative of the general lack of rhetorical invention these books contain. While these sophists promise to teach students "quick tricks," "sneaky tactics,"   and even in the case of one book, "how to use and abuse logic" in only a few pages or minutes, the leading forensics organizations make no such claims. Isocrates (2000) recognized the challenge of in teaching students to become good speakers. He wrote, "(To write) the entire speech properly with considerations (*enthymemata*) and to speak the words rhythmically and musically, these things require much study and are the work of a brave and imaginative soul" (p. 65). Instead of taking a few minutes, directors of forensics ask students to commit years of their life with only the promise of helping them improve. Isocrates also placed immense value in the importance of practice and required his students to practice their own and others speeches repeatedly. "In addition to having the requisite natural ability, the student must learn the form (*eide*) of speeches and practice their uses" (Mirhady & Too, 2000, p. 65). The belief in practice as an educational tool is also central to the pedagogy of modern forensics coaches.   Modern coaches are thus clearly more in line with the teaching and thinking of Isocrates than his Sophistic counterparts.

Most importantly of all, students believe that their participation in the activity has benefited them. Isocrates (2000) wrote, "In fact I have many pupils, some of them spending three to four years with me. None these will be found to have faulted their experiences with me… they so valued the time spent with me that we parted with regret and tears" (p. 221). This experience is one common to many forensics coaches who after several years have students who so valued their experience that they had tears in their eyes. Isocrates' belief that students valued their participation in the activity is backed up by the findings of McMillan and Todd-Mancilas' (1991) whose survey of students involved in competitive forensics found that students believed their participation in the activity to have benefited the development of their self-esteem and education, and helped them to learn valuable skills. Additionally, McMillan and Todd-Mancilas found only 7.6 percent of students surveyed indicated that the value of competition and the desire to win awards was a major motivating factor in their participation in forensics (1991).

2)   Forensics Teaches Rhetorical Convention Rather than Invention

One of the most frequent criticisms lobbed against forensics is that it teaches students conformity towards norms rather than rhetorical invention. As Paine (2005) noted, new students in forensics soon learn that the activity is governed by a plethora of unwritten rules. And while one may agree with Paine's suggestions for encouraging students to challenge these norms, one might also agree with his point that these norms are not always harmful. A more strident critique of these practices comes from Billings (2002) when he wrote, "Successful programs can be defined by who knows the unwritten rules and who does not" (p. 33). Additionally, Kelly and Richardson (2008) argued that there exists a clear lack of educational objectives for the activity. They argue that because of this, we are left with an activity governed by fads, unwritten rules, and the subjective opinions of judges, the result of which becomes "what wins is good, and what is good wins" mentality. These are precisely the type of critique Lysimachus would make in hopes of justifying eliminating forensics at his university.

However, these critiques assume that in forensics, the norms of the activity are stagnant, and that those individuals who succeed in the activity do so not because they have learned the art of rhetoric but because they have learned conformity. Lysimachus would charge a modern Isocrates with not teaching students educational skills but rather teaching them conformity to a prescribed set of arbitrarily conceived conventions. For example, Lysimachus might point to the typical structure of persuasive speeches as problem-cause-solution. One could dispute the factual nature of this claim by pointing to notable examples of students who succeeded with different structures. Or, they might point to historical examples proving that this trend in speech structure is somewhat new and its popularity is proof of an evolving, rather than stagnating, speech culture. In fact, White and Messer (2003) found a number of differences that occurred over time with regards to structure and format of speeches at the Interstate Oratorical Association's annual competition. But, let us assume for a moment that this critique is true, that the great oratory coach Isocrates had to respond to the criticism that he teaches students to structure their speeches in only this format.

When attempting to discover how Isocrates would respond to this charge, we are best served by looking at *Against the Sophists*. It is in this document that Isocrates attempts to distinguish his work and practices from those of the less reputable Sophists. Once again, it appears that forensics coaches are charged with being nothing more than modern Sophists: speech teachers who teach their students a few tricks and conventions but do little to expand their critical thinking and reasoning skills.

In *Against the Sophists*, Isocrates attempts to distinguish himself from his fellow Sophists in several ways. First, Isocrates is keen to point out that the other Sophists treat rhetoric as an ordered art that can be taught easily. In essence, the other Sophists offer a paint by numbers approach to speech making, something which Isocrates rejects. He wrote, "They do not attribute any of this power either to the student's experiences or to his native ability, but they say that the science of speeches is like teaching the alphabet" (Mirhady & Too, 2000, p. 63, line 10). He continued by later pointing out, "They fail to notice that they are using an ordered art (*tetagmene techne*) as a model for creative activity (*poietikon pragma*)" (Mirhady & Too, 2000, p. 64, line 12).

Here we see Isocrates' condemnation of the same sophistry that Lysimachus derides. How then would Isocrates prove he does not fall victim to these practices? Isocrates contrasts his understanding of this creative element with the other Sophists who appear unable to see it as a necessity. He summed this up when he wrote, "The greatest indication of the difference is that speeches cannot be good unless they reflect the circumstances (*kairos*), propriety (to *prepon*), and originality, but none of these requirements extends to letters" (Mirhady & Too, 2000, p. 64, line 12). According to Isocrates, the best speeches can only be produced with a combination of karios, propriety, and creativity. Eloquence as understood by Isocrates can only be created through genuine invention.

Isocrates (2000) defended himself in *Antidosis* by asking his audience to look at the work of his students. Isocrates argued that the eloquence of his students was proof of their understanding of these attributes. There is no doubt that a modern Isocrates would point to speeches written and spoken by his students as evidence of their eloquence. We, too, should point to the work of our students as evidence of the power of rhetorical invention and mastery taught by our activity. In particular, we might point to the examples of exemplary speeches. Since forensics is a competitive activity, it might suggest that we would hold up examples of final round speeches and performances as evidence of the eloquence students are capable of producing. Isocrates reminds us that rhetoricians produce eloquence, but Sophists "write speeches that are worse than private citizens might improvise" (p. 63). Even the most strident critic of forensics would have to concede that the speeches in the final rounds of national tournaments exceed in skill and quality the speeches given by ordinary private citizens. Indeed, the speeches and performance given in preliminary rounds at an average tournament far exceed those of the average college student in terms of originality, strength of argument, complexity of ideas expressed, and delivery. Examining the product produced in public speaking classes versus those produced by competitive forensics provides clear proof that competition can and does create eloquence. Furthermore, this eloquence is recognized by those outside of the activity as is proven by the fact that numerous competitive forensics speeches appear as examples in public speaking textbooks alongside the most famous and important speeches in history (Cronn-Mills & Schnoor, 2003).

3)   Forensics Fails to Teach Students "Real World" Skills and Abilities

Having failed to prove his case, Lysimachus would continue his attack on forensics by contending that the activity teaches students tricks and tactics rather than skills and abilities. Here Lysimachus might draw upon the works of one of Isocrates' contemporaries, Plato. When critiquing rhetoric in *Gorgias*, through the mouthpiece of Socrates, Plato argued that rhetoric is a false art akin to flattery and cookery (Nichols, 1998). According to Plato, the goal of these false arts was not to teach skills but rather to teach tricks aimed at obscuring truth. Since the rhetoric of Plato's time focused largely on the creation and performance of speeches, his critique applies to the world of forensics.

In recent years, a variety of questions have been raised concerning normative practices in forensics, or what appear to some to be arbitrary rules. For example, the perennial discussion that occurs on the IE-L concerning the use of black books in interpretation events. Individuals question everything from the color and size of the book, to the necessity of it in the first place. In recent debates on the IE-L concerning proposed rule changes being considered by National Forensics Association, one point of discussion focused on the normative requirement that students memorize their speeches for extemporaneous speaking performances. These are just two examples of the many conventions and rules that govern behavior in competitive forensics. The purpose of this article is not to critique or defend these practices, as this has already been done in other venues, but to point out that these practices, good or bad, do not inherently take away from the benefits this activity provides to its students.

Some of the conventions of our activity might seem odd to an ancient Isocrates, but the modern version of the man would have no problem defending them. Isocrates himself created a number of conventions and norms for public speaking that were embodied by his students. While Isocrates stressed the importance of content in speeches more than other ancient teachers, he still understood the importance of diction and style. He believed in the importance of a precise vocabulary and of the use of allusions and illustrations to and from history and philosophy. One of his greatest contributions to Greek oratory was that he freed it from the stiff style of prose that become commonplace and crafted a freer, slower, smoother method of writing and delivering speeches (Mirhady & Too, 2000). For evidence of Isocrates' own commitment to producing a polished end product, one needs to look no further than his work on *Panegyricus*, which he took 10 years to polish before publishing. Students who emerged from his school had a distinct and unique speaking style that would come to define oratorical style for years to come. Even more important than the specific conventions he bred into his students was his commitment to teach his students to think critically and speak eloquently: a commitment that is shared by current coaches and teachers in forensics. The point is that all forms of performance by nature develop conventions, and students taught by the same teacher will come to share certain traits. Yet these conventions are minor aspects of performances and do not negate the educational value of this activity.

While, forensics is governed by conventions and norms, it is still an activity that encourages students to think critically and deeply. Take, for example, the event of persuasive speaking, which asks students to persuade their audience to think or behave

differently. These speeches necessarily involve the condemnation of some current behavior or policy and the advocating of a solution to the identified problem. Isocrates found these types of speeches to be of great value to the development of his students. "Speeches which denounce our current mistakes are much more useful and more powerful than those which eulogize out past deeds, and likewise, those which advise what we must do are better than those which narrate our history" (2000, p. 217). He concluded that these types of speeches are especially important because their products are rarer, more difficult to create, and require a more "acute mind" (p. 220). If forensics was oriented only to towards the achievement of competitive goals, then there would be no need to concern itself with the problems of modern society.

  4) Forensics Corrupts Youth by Teaching Students Values and Traditions Not In Line with Ethical Reasoning and Thinking

Perhaps the most damaging critique has been left for last. Several current and former coaches have charged that forensics fails to teach students ethical reasoning and thinking and instead teaches students only to value the end of trophies and competitive success (Billings, 2002; Burnett, Brand, & Meister, 2003; Kelly & Richardson, 2008; Richardson & Richardson, 2010). This is a hard claim to attack in part because the coaches put forth this claim without either data or a sufficient warrant, something a teacher of logic like Isocrates would be sure to notice. For example, Burnett, Brand, and Meister (2003) offer no hard proof of the failures of forensics and instead rely on an ideological mythic critique of the activity that only succeeds if one accepts the unproven claims that: 1) education and competition are mutually exclusive; and 2) competitors and coaches value winning more than ethical or educational values. Ironically, to accept Burnett et al.'s argument (2003) premise, you must first accept their conclusion. Additionally, none of the critiques supported their claims through survey research talking to past or present students, outcome-based statistical analysis of students' performances, or even anecdotal evidence. When defending himself against similar charges, Isocrates questions the lack of proof. The response he offered to the original Lysimachus applies equally well to the Lysimachus he might face today. Isocrates wrote, "For he ought to show the speeches by which I corrupt my students, and name the students who have become worse through association with me. As it is, he has done none of these things" (2000, p. 222).

  One practice critics often point to as being unethical, or at the very least uneducational, is the practice of coaches giving students topics to speak about. Billings (2005) would view this as part of the mastery of the "success formula." Coaches who know the formula or type of topics that will be successful choose them and take away students' abilities to discuss the issues that concern them. First, I must acknowledge that I believe the instances of this happening have been greatly overstated. Rarely, if ever, have I heard or witnessed a coach assigning a student a topic and forcing them to do it. I do not believe this practice takes place, and if it does, it accounts for such a small percentage of students' experiences that it does not bear discussing. The far more common scenario that occurs, from what has been gathered during experiences at three different universities and talk with numerous other coaches is that coaches put together a list of topics which they find interesting and which will allow students to be competitively successful. Students who have been unable to find a topic on their own can

then examine the list and, through conversations with coaches, select a topic that appeals to them. The process of finding a good speech topic or piece of literature is hard, and one of our jobs as coaches is to aid students in helping them select viable topics and pieces to perform. Additionally, as students gets older and more experienced, they are able to find their own topics and literature and need less guidance.

Isocrates would find these practices to be ethical. Writing in *Antidosis,* Isocrates discusses the need for teachers to give their students good topics on which to speak. According to Isocrates, this process was necessary for the growth of the student. He claimed that giving students good topics to consider ennobles those students. The contemplation of good topics encourages civic and critical thinking and forces the student to contemplate the world beyond their own lives. "Someone who chooses to speak and write speeches worthy of praise and honor will not possibly select topics that are unjust or insignificant… but those public issues which are important and noble and promote human welfare" (Mirhady & Too, 2000, p. 255). The completive nature of speech leads students to talk about issues and concerns central to welfare of their audience. Forensics competitions are routinely judged by members outside the forensics community and in order to be successful, students must choose topics that appeal to these judges as well. Perhaps the best example of the need to do this is the Interstate Oratorical competition, where the final round is judged by esteemed citizens from outside the forensics community. Students competing here must choose topics and construct speeches capable of persuading these non-forensicators. "I would surely exhort those who live under democracy to consider the interest of the people" (p. 219). Thus, we ought to see the choosing of topics that interest our audience as a good thing, because it forces students and coaches to consider their audiences.

Although my experiences are only anecdotal, I have known many students on the teams I have been a part of and on other teams, who began the year with a topic a coach helped them select, one they would have never come to on their own, and through the process of research and learning about the topic, developed a passion for the topic. When students join teams as freshmen, their worldviews and experiences are limited. One of the goals of higher education in both Isocrates' and our time is to expose students to concepts and ideas they would not otherwise have been exposed to. Again, I am not advocating for coaches to assign topics to students, but rather help students find a topic that interests them and will ennoble them is one of the vital duties we have as coaches.

I expect that some may take issue with my earlier statement, when I noted that my goal is to help find students topics that will interest them and allow them to be competitively successful. The selection of topics for competitive reasons was a practiced greatly derided by Burnett et. al (2003) as being one that puts winning above education. However, having a topic that interests the speaker and the audience is the essence of eloquence and virtue as defined by Isocrates (Mirhady & Too, 2000). The essence of the concept *karios* is the ability to adapt to an audience and understand their circumstances. One cannot be truly eloquent in Isocrates' mind if that person speaks on topics that interest only him- or herself or in a manner that is off-putting to the audience. Furthermore, to return to the previous discussion of "real world" skills, Isocrates argued that to understand *karios* was the most important real world skill a student could learn.

The claim of corrupting the youth by teaching them poor values is a serious one. After all, it was this same claim that led to the death of the great teacher Socrates. It was

also a claim that Isocrates was forced to confront in his own time, and the defense he offered is one which we ought to examine. The Isocratic ethic says that teachers are responsible for the actions of their students. He believed that a teacher serves as a model for his students, and he went to great lengths in *Antidosis* to defend the lives of his students (2000). Given all the time he spent with his students, literally years, one would hope his teachings and beliefs would rub off on them. Let us follow the lead of Isocrates and examine the ethicality of our activity by examining the students it attracts and produces.

Even the most strident critics of forensics must concede that the activity has attracted some of the best and brightest high school and college students in the nation. One must therefore wonder: What do these great students see in this activity if the only benefit it provides is a few pieces of cheap metal and plastic? In addition to attracting great students, forensics has produced a litany of noteworthy individuals. The alumni of this activity include members of the United States Senate and House of Representatives, Supreme Court justices, awarding-winning actors and actresses, media moguls, prominent journalists, and some the nation's most forward thinking and progressive minds. As Isocrates (2000) said, "If I was responsible for none of their accomplishments but they were simply my friends and associates, I think even this is an adequate defense against the charge I face" (p. 223).

Additionally, participation in high school forensics is a great aid to many in getting into the best colleges in the nation because admission counselors believe that competition in speech and debate prepares students for the rigors of higher education (Luong, 2000). A position paper published by the National Forensics League (2011) noted numerous studies prove students involved in speech and debate display higher levels of critical thinking and participation in forensics boosts retention and graduation rates. It would seem, therefore, that this activity has attracted high quality students, has high quality alumni, and is acknowledged by outsiders to the community as producing and attracting great students. Isocrates told the jury in Antidosis that if his students were good people who had helped Athens, then they should be praised for their actions. He continued, "However, if they turned out to be wicked and the sort of men who denounce (phainein) others, indict (graphesthai) them, lay charges, and desire their goods, then punish me" (p. 223). Burnett (2002) even conceded this point when she stated that her great joy as a coach came from working with wonderful students and that her day was brightened by hearing from former students, proof that she has found this activity attracts and produces great students.

Furthermore, Isocrates (2000) noted that if he offered students nothing but corruption, then they would not travel from far and wide to learn from him. "It is evident that people travel by ship, pay money, and got to all sorts of trouble because they think they will become better and that their educators here will be more intelligent than those at home" (p. 247). Many students involved in forensics chose to go to their university because of the education and coaching offered by the school's forensics program. Additionally, Isocrates pointed out that if he truly corrupted students then it would not be Lysimachus who would be bringing charges against him, but the parents and loved ones of the students he corrupts. "Instead they bring me their sons, pay my fees, and rejoice when they see them spending the day with me, while the sycophants slander us and give us trouble" (p. 249). Similarly, if forensics offered students nothing of value and taught

them poor values, then parents should be lining up to complain about our activity, but instead they have proven to be some of our strongest supporters.

Lysimachus might still object to the value of the activity, arguing that these successful students are merely anomalies or outliers (although, in fact, the list of successful former forensicators is so long, we could easily fill a year's worth of this journal's pages with their names), Isocrates would still have no problem rebuking this claim. For, in Isocrates' defense of himself and his craft, he points not only to the examples of his best students but to the general practice of all his students when compared to the general population of their peers. He noted that while the young men entering his academia are hard at work, those outside it "spend their youth in drink, social gatherings, amusements, and games, while neglecting the serious business of self improvement" (p. 257). While I might not go so far in my condemnation of how the average college student spends his or her free time, I will say that if you compare those students who spend their weekends at forensics tournaments to those students who spend their weekend drinking, partying, and seeking amusement, there is little doubt as to who is having the more educational experience.

CONCLUSION

Reading this essay has provided the reader with another tool to use in defending competitive forensics. A wide variety of challenges will face our community in the coming years, and we ought to take every opportunity we have to defend forensics in every way that we can. The work of Isocrates provides a unique and thus far untapped resource for justifying the budgets, course releases, and time commitment needed to field a forensics team. The rhetoric of ancient Greece and Rome possess ethos, pathos, and logos that are useful when debating critics of the activity or when communicating to those unfamiliar with it. In addition to the excellent qualitative and quantitative work currently being done, we ought to create rhetorical defenses for the activity as well.

REFERENCES

Benoit, W. L. (1984). Isocrates on rhetorical education. *Communication Education, 33*(2), 109-119.

Berquist, G. F. (1959). Isocrates of Athens: Foremost speech teacher of the ancient world. *Speech Teacher, 8*(3), 251-256.

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

Burnett, A. (2002). Ain't no cure for the coaching blues. *National Forensics Journal, 20*(1), 79-81.

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

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

Depew, D., & Poulakos, T. (Eds.). (2004). *Isocrates and civic education*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

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

Hinck, E. A. (2003). Managing the dialectical tension between competition and education in forensics: A response to Burnett, Brand, & Meister. *National Forensics Journal, 21*(1), 60-76.

Kelly, B., & Richardson, R. (2008). *Re-examining competition and education in collegiate forensics establishing the need for a pedagogical prerogative perspective*. Paper presented at the National Developmental Conference on Individual Events, Peoria, IL.

Kirch, M. W. (2005). Program BUDGETing: Six keys to success. *National Forensics Journal, 23*(1), 69-74.

Luong, M. A. (2000). Forensics and college admissions. *Rostrum, 75*(3), 5-6.

Matsen, P., Rollinson, P., & Sousa, M. (1990). *Readings from classical rhetoric*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois.

McMillan, J. K., & Todd-Mancilas, W. R. (1991). An assessment of the values of individual events in forensics competition from students' perspectives. *National Forensics Journal, 9*, 1-17.

Mills, D., Pettus, A. B., & Dickmeyer, S. G. (1993). The role of forensics when departments and programs are targeted for elimination: Ensuring a "call for support" is heard. *National Forensics Journal, 11*, 53-58.

Mirhady, D. C., & Too, Y. L. (2000). *Isocrates*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Newell, M. (2009). Higher education budget cuts: How are they affecting students? Report 09-27. *California Postsecondary Education Commission*.

National Forensics League. (2011). Scholastic benefits of speech and debate activities. Ripon, WI: National Forensics League.

Nichols, J. H. (1988). *Plato "Gorgias."* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Norlin, G. (1980). Isocrates' Antidosis Isocrates with an English translation in three volumes. Boston: Harvard University Press. Retrieved from http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/.

Paine, R. E. (2005). Identifying and evaluating the "unwritten rules" of competition. *National Forensics Journal, 25*(1), 79-88.

Richardson, R. R., & Richardson, K. B. (2010, August). *Forensics leadership: An Isocratean vision*. Paper presented at the National Developmental Conference on Individual Events, Minneapolis, MN.

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

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

Working Together: Examining Forensic Leadership through LMX Theory

Ben Walker
Southwest Minnesota State University

Julie L. G. Walker
Independent Scholar

Forensic teams function as organizations with a variety of leadership styles used. To better understand how we lead, we need to more closely study organizational communication theory. With the ever-present need to provide links from theory to forensic practice, this paper outlines leader member exchange (LMX) theory and how it can be applied to forensic leadership for positive organizational outcomes. Implementation strategies are offered along with suggestions for future directions of research. Ideally, this paper will act as a resource for those wishing to explore LMX theory in their forensic leadership.

It is no secret that in the activity of competitive collegiate forensic speaking, leadership and team culture play a large role in retaining students and keeping them happy (Worthen, 1995; Miller, 2005), as well as in increasing productivity (Croucher, Thorton, & Eckstein, 2006). While forensic teams act like many other organizations in this sense, they differ because of the change that occurs due to student-competitor turnover (Swanson, 1992). Successful teams are able to persevere in spite of this challenge due to exceptional leadership since coaches are the constant variable in team culture. The way a team is run ends up symbolizing the team identity that everyone shares because it provides something that all the members can relate to (Eisenberg & Riley, 2001). In an activity that has constant membership turnover, forensic coaches must find a way to connect to their team to continue to motivate students to stay active and successful competitors.

With some exceptions (i.e.: Dreibelbis, 1989; Elton, 1989; Schnoor and Green, 1989), forensic research from the organizational standpoint has focused on what increases team unity and cohesion, examining what the coach can do to assist large-group impact and, to some extent, what a coach can do with individual interactions with students. The forensic leadership model varies from team to team, but forensic scholars approach team organization with the coach being seen as the leader and with the students being the subordinates. The idea of coaches as mentors or teachers (Hinck, 2003; White, 2005) is prevalent in forensics, attempting to capture the unique leadership dynamic of collegiate forensics. Drawing from the field of athletic coaching, within the roles of mentor and teacher, coaches stand to influence players considerably by filling a leadership position that encapsulates both support and instruction (Smith & Smoll, 1990; Turman, 2001; Turman & Schrodt, 2004; Zhang & Jenson, 1997).

Bennetts (2002) defined traditional mentor relationships as "intimate learning alliances that happen naturally" (p. 155). This seems to fit with how many collegiate forensics coaches and student competitors build working relationships; the relationships develop out of circumstance, but the depth of the relationship is developed through a more organic process. As White (2005) pointed out, a coach gets to know students beyond crafting speeches and, through that relationship development, "seeks to guide the student to success in all aspects of life" (p. 89).

Friedley & Manchester (2005) noted that healthy team cultures need a mutual respect to succeed; close working relationships between coaches and student-competitors are no different. Competitors who are actively engaged in the activity are more likely to have close working relationships with their coaches. Often competitors expect a deep relationship with their coaches and vice-versa. As Walker (2011) argued, managing relationships with students can be difficult, and, thus, each relationship should be handled on an individual basis. Essentially, coaches need to approach leadership differently with each student.

The concept of personalized leadership is well studied. Mid-20th century leadership scholarship focused on which traits produced effective leaders, but scholars began to recognize the short-sightedness in only exploring effectiveness based upon leaders' behaviors. Graen and Uhl-Bein (1995), noted leadership scholars, began exploring three separate domains: the leader, the follower, and the relationships leaders and followers shared. During the explosion of literature that followed, a new concept was proposed: Leader-Member Exchange.

Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) theory was originally named Vertical Dyad Linkage (Cashman, Dansereau, Graen, & Haga, 1976; Dansereau, Graen, and Haga, 1975; Graen & Cashman, 1975). Essentially the researchers suggested leaders do not interact with each individual subordinate in exactly the same way (an assumption of prior leadership theory), but that each dyad shared a unique relationship. Studying the redubbed LMX theory (Graen, Novak, and Sommerkamp, 1982), scholars began linking high quality relationships with a variety of positive organizational outcomes, such as commitment, innovation, empowerment, employee learning, job satisfaction, organizational citizenship behaviors, productivity, and retention (Bezuijen, van Dam, and van den Berg, 2010; Fisk and Friesen, 2012; Jones, 2009; Truckenbrodt, 2000). Thus, as Jones observed, LMX theory became "one of the most widely researched theories in leadership" (p. 3).

LMX makes the relationship between leaders and followers the focal point of the leadership process (Northouse, 2004). These relationships fall under two basic categories: high quality and low quality. Dienesch and Liden (1986) described high quality relationships as characterized by high levels of "trust, interaction, support, and formal/informal rewards" (p. 621) while low quality relationships did not receive these benefits. House and Aditya (1997) emphasized in high quality LMX relationships there is a "high degree of mutual influence and obligation between superiors and subordinates" (p. 430). LMX theory does not dictate which behaviors or traits will be effective in every situation. Instead it offers suggestions regarding how leaders could approach situations with the end-goal being high-quality relationship development and maintenance with all subordinates.

As Darvish and Farzane-dokht (2011) argued, "managers can only perform all their duties well, when they possess the skill of interaction and creating proper relationship with employees," (p. 1252), and the situational nature of each relationship requires a variety of approaches to be utilized. Forensic coaches can more effectively lead their organizations by employing LMX behaviors with student-competitors. This article will examine the benefits of high quality LMX relationships and offer steps to achieving those benefits in the context of forensic team leadership.

Benefits Tied to High-Quality LMX Relationships

Using an LMX leadership style can yield many benefits in a forensic context if coaches can develop what Fairhurst and Hamlett (2003) called high-quality LMX relationships with their students. Benefits include increased satisfaction and productivity, higher commitment levels, escalated organizational citizenship behaviors, and higher autonomy for the coach and the student.

Two of the major benefits of a high-quality LMX relationship are increased satisfaction and productivity. Much research has highlighted the subordinate benefit of increased work satisfaction as a result of high-quality LMX relationships (Dienesch and Liden, 1986; Gertsner and Day, 1997; Scandura and Graen, 1984). Volmer, Niessen, Spurk, Linz, and Abele (2011) defined job satisfaction as feeling emotionally positive regarding social relationships in the workplace and having a positive attitude regarding the work the individual accomplishes and the environment in which that work takes place. Forensic students could feel satisfied with their work regardless of competitive success because of the high-quality LMX relationship they have with their coach. When individuals are more satisfied, they are more productive (Ostroff, 1992); additional research suggests employees in high-quality LMX relationships have been found to have improved productivity and a higher quality of performance (Bezuijen, van Dam, van den Berg, and Thierry, 2010; House and Aditya, 1997; Jones, 2009). Forensic students are more likely to work on their events, team tasks, or other academic work if they are satisfied with their role in the group, and they may be more committed to a higher level of performance. Wayne, Shore, and Liden (1997) found "LMX was positively related to performance [which results in] outcomes that directly benefit leaders" (p. 105). Thus, when a coach and student share a high-quality LMX relationship, the student will likely enjoy increased satisfaction, productivity, and performance, which benefits the student, the coach, and the team.

Organizational commitment also positively correlates to the quality of LMX relationships developed by the leader. Truckenbrodt (2000) defined commitment as company loyalty exhibited by employees based on perceived shared goals, objectives, and values. Mowday, Steers , and Porter (1979) noted the relative strength of commitment depends upon how much the individual identifies with and is involved in the organization. Ostroff (1992) found commitment level correlates with a lower turnover rate, something forensic coaches struggle to combat. Ferris (1985) and Gertsner and Day (1997) found positive relationships between LMX relationships and subordinate retention, intent to turnover, and overall commitment to the organization. As Truckenbrodt concluded, "improving the quality of LMX will increase subordinates' sense of commitment [which] will benefit not only the supervisors and the subordinates,

but also the organization as a whole in the achievement of organizational growth and success" (p. 242). On a forensics team, organizational commitment and competitor retention must occur before the organization can achieve its goals, and one way coaches can elicit commitment and retention is through developing high-quality LMX relationships with each competitor.

Increased commitment is linked to increased organizational citizenship behaviors, which leads to more and better work completed by the individual (Tzy-Yuan, Jiang, Klein, and Chou, 2011; Walumbwa, Cropanzano, and Goldman, 2011). Organizational citizenship behaviors involve both meeting and going beyond expectations to benefit the organization, such as volunteering for additional unpaid work assignments. Forensic coaches could see higher student turnout for peer coaching, service projects, or speech camps. The more committed the student is to the team, the more likely he or she is to help the team reach its fullest potential. Truckenbrodt (2000) argued organizational citizenship behaviors improve "the effectiveness of the organization by the high degree of work group performance in terms of quantity and quality of work" (p. 235). Competitors engaging in organizational citizenship behaviors may voluntarily take on leadership roles to their primary responsibility of preparing speech performances. Competitors may also work harder and achieve higher levels of success because they feel they more closely identify with the coach and the team.

Forensics coaches often have teaching, advising, committee, and research tasks in addition to their team responsibilities, so coaches would especially benefit from the higher levels of autonomy resulting from high-quality LMX relationships with their students. Volmer, Spurk, and Niessen (2012) found job autonomy positively correlated to LMX relationship quality. The relationship may be influenced by Bezuijen, van Dam, van den Berg, and Thierry's (2010) finding that leaders heavily influence "employee engagement in learning activities," (p. 675) which they associated with a subordinate's motivation to learn. Members seeking autonomy place the onus of responsibility upon themselves to learn the skills necessary for success. Students who perceive their coaches as supporting their development may seek both to learn more about how to complete their work independently, but also more creatively. Numerous studies have also positively linked LMX with creativity in the workplace, especially when members enjoyed high levels of job autonomy (Scott and Bruce, 1994; Darvish and Farzan-Dokht, 2011; Volmer Spurk, and Niessen, 2012). Forensic students can profit from increased freedom and learning opportunities, and coaches can empower students to seek success while decreasing their own long-term workload. In order to reap the benefits of a high-quality LMX relationship, coaches must utilize several behaviors, which will be described in the next section.

Developing High-Quality LMX Relationship Behaviors for Forensic Coaches

Working together in a high-quality LMX relationship would seem to be desired by both coach and student. However, determining what students and coaches want in a high-quality LMX relationship can be difficult. Building from the organizational communication literature, suggested behaviors for forensic coaches are proposed to help establish high-quality LMX relationships with their students.

Coach Introspection

Before engaging in relationship building, an individual must be aware of his or her own tendencies as a leader. Introspection is an important step in building awareness and consciously making leadership choices to benefit a coach's team and organization.

Coaches need to be aware of their own personal characteristics because it might influence a relationship with a student. In some instances, likeness between a coach and student can be beneficial. For example, Wayne, Liden, and Sparrowe (1994) noted dyads of the same sex had a higher probability of high-quality exchange relationships. Also, Sears and Hackett (2011) identified some characteristics, such as positive affectivity and the need for power, to be positively correlated to LMX relationship quality. However, differences can also be helpful. McClane (1991) observed other characteristics, such as locus of control and need for achievement, to be characteristics where dissimilarity between leader and follower correlate to positive outcomes.

Beyond personal characteristics, coaches need to know what place forensics will take in their lives. Do they want to be available 24 hours/day for students? Do they want to be Facebook friends with students? Do they want to be the one the student calls to bail them out of jail? Recognizing the boundaries a coach has is important knowledge to have prior to building purposeful relationships with students.

Forensics coaches must also take care to monitor their emotional behavioral displays. Jones (2009) investigated the emotional behaviors utilized by various leaders to determine the overall impacts on LMX relationships. She identified three types of emotional displays: surface acting, deep acting, and genuine emotions. Surface acting occurs when an individual disingenuously displays emotional cues in an attempt to elicit specific behaviors. Deep acting occurs when an individual matches internal emotional reactions to match external expressions being expressed for a specific purpose. The difference between surface and deep acting is the authenticity with which they are felt and perceived by fellow communicators. A coach must attempt to appear excited (or another emotion), even when they may not be, to achieve deep acting. Genuine emotional displays occur naturally, without the individual attempting to alter his or her projected cues.

While ideally a coach would be able to convey genuine emotional displays at all times, it is not always possible to naturally feel with conviction the desired emotion. At times a coach may feel anger or frustration when a student does not show up to a coaching appointment, but must project calm and positive feelings instead. This can be extremely difficult to manage. Therefore leaders seeking high-quality LMX relationships should attempt to engage in deep acting emotional displays to capitalize on the more genuine message it conveys to subordinates. Failing to monitor emotional behaviors can lead subordinates to distrust the leaders' messages, thereby decreasing the overall quality of the LMX relationship.

A coach must know his or her personal characteristics and communication tendencies in order to monitor and potentially change them for the betterment of the student/coach relationship. For example, if specific boundaries from work to private life are desired, make sure students cannot see personal social media accounts, and designate times for availability during the day. Knowing personal characteristics and tendencies can help a coach adapt to each student by seeing potential connections and conflicts that may arise in each relationship. Once a coach has examined himself or herself through

introspection and modified any potential relationship hurdles, he or she can start getting to know the students.

Establish Clear Roles

A forensic coach's relationship with a student starts when they first meet each other. The early stages of a relationship are vital to its success; developing the relationship between the leader and the subordinate is the most important step in the LMX process. It is often tempting for coaches to only meet students through a large scale meeting, but each individual leader-subordinate relationship should be unique and each situation may call for different leadership behaviors (Darvish & Farzane-dokht, 2011). Forensic coaches need to establish roles within each dyad to have potential for a high-quality LMX relationship with a student. Sears and Hackett (2011) observed that especially in the formative stages of a relationship, the clarity of roles for each dyad member heavily impacted LMX quality as role clarity was tied to the ability to complete tasks. The ability to complete tasks was connected to leaders' perceptions about followers' overall performance, which then impacted relationship quality. On small forensic teams, getting to know each student may not be difficult, but for larger teams, coaches may want to have a plan for how to meet all their students. Of course, this is just the start to the relationship. Dyads will change and grow over time.

Bauer and Green (1995) found that LMX dyads are dynamic and their relationships were "developed or negotiated over time through a series of exchanges" (p. 1538). Graen and Uhl-Bien (1995) found in a review of LMX literature that the basic time characterizations in an LMX lifecycle progressed through three stages: Stranger, Acquaintance, and Maturity. Dyads progress from a loosely connected set of leader-subordinate goals with primarily a top-down leadership emphasis in the Stranger stage through role negotiation and familiarization in the Acquaintance stage to the Maturity stage where both individuals mutually influence one another and work toward common goals. Relationships characterized as low-quality remain in the Stranger stage, while relationships characterized as high-quality progressed to the Maturity stage. Those relationships who lingered in the Acquaintance stage would eventually slip back into the Stranger stage and would fall into the low-quality relationship category.

Coaches seeking Maturity stage relationships should begin the Stranger stage (when the student first joins the team) with explicit establishment of roles for both the coach and student. Clear boundaries must be established between expected, acceptable behavior and unacceptable behavior. By communicating explicit procedural guidelines for what is expected of students during coaching sessions, team meetings, and at tournaments, coaches establish the leader and follower roles. Initial interactions with students set the tone for the relationship the coach desires, so coaches should consciously formulate their intended communicational behaviors in the Stranger stage. Whether the coach establishes a more formal or informal relationship, coaches still need to establish themselves as the leaders of the team. For example, a coach might prefer all coaching sessions to be held in the office with a designated notebook for each student, while another coach might hold an appointment while eating lunch in a restaurant. One coach might find swearing acceptable in dialogue with the student. Another coach might require the students to address them by the professional title (Dr. or Professor). The clear articulation of boundaries and expectations for how the coach will act and respond lets

the student know where the coach stands regarding the role as boss. Likewise, student roles as the followers, or "subordinates," need to be made definite. The expectations should be clear because ambiguity or inconsistency can lead to subordinates feeling intimidated by the leader (Troutwine, 2006). After students understand the expectations in general for coaching sessions, meetings, and tournaments, the coach-student relationship can begin to progress to the Adaptation and Maturation stages of the LMX relationship.

One way to help the move forward from the Stranger stage is to recognize and emphasize the similarities shared between the leader and the subordinate. A coach should use what they learned via introspection to help tailor their relationship with each student. Jones (2009) suggested "perceived similarity in attitudes, values, and experiences" (p. 7) directly correlates to the overall LMX relationship's quality. Dissimilarity between parties that may lead to low-quality LMX relationships, Jones wrote, can occur based on a number of qualities such as dependability, decision-making styles, trust, communication frequency and style, demographics, sex, and education dissimilarity. Therefore if a female coach with her doctorate who is verbose and outgoing is speaking with a quiet male first-year student, she may want to attempt to tone down her usual outgoing nature to help the student begin feeling more comfortable with the relationship. Of course, the best way to assist in the future growth of the relationship is to keep channels of communication open between coach and student.

Encourage Two-way Communication

Beyond simply being similar or dissimilar to their subordinates (which often an uncontrollable factor), leaders can engage in high quality communication with subordinates. The suggested behaviors focus on encouraging two-way communication, monitoring emotional behaviors, and noting subordinates with high levels of communication apprehension. Truckenbrodt (2000) suggested communication should be encouraged to flow both upwards and downwards in the LMX dyadic relationships. She suggested "supervisors should actively encourage subordinates to provide feedback and vice-versa [because] open communication is necessary to establish a sense of trust in the exchange relationship" (pp. 241-242). Creating this type of open communication flow can be aided through specific communication behaviors. Darvish and Farzane-dokht (2011) believed leaders should develop a tolerance for both contradictions and tolerance for seemingly impossible solution suggestions. Building an environment where subordinates feel free communicate their opinions or ideas is necessary to subordinates feeling as though they are valued members of the organization. Dienesch and Liden (1986) pointed out when subordinates do not feel they are trusted by their leaders, the subordinates may respond by not accepting the feedback or goals put forward by the leader.

Leaders must also be aware of the communication apprehension experienced by their subordinates. McCroskey (1977) defined communication apprehension as "the fear or anxiety associated with either real or anticipated communication with another person or persons" (p. 78). Madlock, Martin, Bogdan, and Ervin (2007) found subordinates who experience high levels of communication apprehension tend to experience lower quality LMX relationships, which could be explained by a multitude of reasons. Those who experience high communication apprehension tend to avoid communication encounters,

or when they engage in communication encounters, they exhibit more nervous tendencies which could come off as disingenuous. Leaders who are aware of the communication apprehension felt by subordinates can work to make the individuals feel more at ease or can help them practice behaviors that will help overcome communication apprehension. Doing so may be the key to developing those higher quality LMX relationships.

In the forensic context, a coach must keep lines of communication readily available. If a student feels as if he or she cannot approach their coach to discuss a concern or suggestion, the certain lack of trust can develop which may hinder the relationship. LMX theory suggests that leaders must be open to discussing ideas with their subordinates and listening to dissenting ideas. A forensic coach can actively seek out this communication by inviting questions and feedback during team meetings and during one-on-one interactions and coaching. Listening to student ideas and concerns on anything from team logistic issues to personal problems can go a long way to help the relationship grow in the desired direction. Seeking out those opportunities through more non-traditional means of communication for forensic teams (such as evaluation forms or suggestion boxes) can help a coach create a sense of open communication, even with students who may feel intimidated by a coach through no fault of the coach.

Monitoring emotional behaviors of students also can enhance the relationship. Beyond accepting feedback, coaches should do emotional check-ups with students on a regular basis. General observation of student behaviors can be a good start to determining if something is wrong or if the student is unhappy, but having direct methods of asking students about their emotional well-being gives the students an opportunity to express themselves with less ambiguity. Instead of operating under guess work, coaches can remind the students of their desire to help and ask if they are feeling happy with the relationship or other situations. Directly approaching students may help with some forms of communication apprehension.

Staying accessible is also an important action to keep communication open between coach and student. If a coach has an office or workspace, he or she should be seen in that area frequently by students. This helps the student know the coach is available to talk and work with the student. Office doors should remain open whenever possible to encourage discussion. Coaches should encourage students to email them with questions or call them on their cell phones. Accessibility is an important way to show young undergraduate students that communication is a priority and the communicative door is always wide open—literally and figuratively.

Of course, this does not mean that a coach must always be available to talk. Setting boundaries early for open communication highlights to students that a coach is willing to have discussions, but certain circumstances require delayed interaction. Establishing these expectations early will help coaches keep communication lines open but also will enable them to have personalized involvement. Utilization of said behaviors may position leaders, followers, and organizations to achieve the benefits associated with high-quality LMX relationships previously discussed.

Coaches can also encourage communication by helping students deal with communication apprehension. Having set times to meet on a regular basis may help many students, as well as trying to be generally welcoming. Graen and Uhl-Bien (1995) identified three characteristics as the predominant considerations for leaders attempting to

build high-quality LMX relationships: "respect, trust, and obligation" (p. 237). Agreeableness and likability of an individual also seems to impact the overall quality of dyadic LMX relationship development. Sears and Hackett (2011) characterized agreeableness through behaviors such as "warmth, friendliness, tact, and sensitivity" (p. 547). Their research found leaders and subordinates who utilized agreeableness behaviors tended to show higher levels of regard for one another, which increased the quality of their dyadic LMX relationships. Being understanding and accommodating of communication apprehension by adapting behaviors to each student can help a coach earn the trust need to reach a high-quality relationship.

Include Students in Goal Setting

Forensic coaches can make sure students are more than goal achievers, but also are defining what goals they should chase. Truckenbrodt (2000) outlined the importance of clearly tying an organization's goals to the role each subordinate plays in achieving those goals. She suggested, "an organizational culture that provides such awareness instills a sense of belonging and a positive feeling of identification with the organization, thus enhancing the subordinate's commitment to the organization" (p. 235). To more effectively encourage members to recognize the shared individual and organizational goals, the leader should invite the members to play a role in goal making.

It is often convenient for a leader to personally set organizational and individual member goals, but this is not the best method for high-quality LMX relationships. Leaders should utilize alternative methods, such as participative decision making. Utilization of subordinate-input in decision making processes can positively project a leader's trust of and value for subordinates' role in the organization (Scandura, Graen, & Novak,1986). Leaders can improve overall motivation to adopt organizational goals as individual goals by engaging in participative decision-making processes.

Because of the time spent working with students, setting program and individual goals may be something that forensic coaches wish to do on their own. However, coaches should allow students to set their own goals. This creates a sense of ownership in one's work, but also shows to the student that a coach is not mandating what they must define as success. Goal setting should be done early in the relationship and each season so coaches can work better with students to help achieve the student's personal goals. The coach and student should discuss potential goals for a variety of categories, such as social, academic, and competition. After the student has had time to think about what he or she would like to achieve, a one-on-one meeting with a coach should be held. In the meeting, the coach and student should discuss what the student's goals are, what they mean, and how to go about achieving the goals. Articulating personal desires and having a coach make plans to see those benchmarks reached can enhance the student's perception of the coach's trust and respect for the student. Building a trusting and respectful relationship makes the benefits of the high-quality LMX relationship much more likely.

Particularly important to developing high-quality individual relationships is making sure goals are accomplished and offering members praise when that happens. Wayne, Shore, and Liden (1997) described perceived organizational support, or the subordinate's perception of how the organization invests in and provides positive reinforcement for the subordinate's work. One way leaders can do this is by recognizing

the quality of work performance being completed by the subordinates in ways appropriate to the subordinates. Some individuals desire public recognition when they have accomplished a difficult or time-consuming task. Others want individual recognition and would prefer not to publicly receive praise for accomplishments. Coaches seeking high-quality LMX relationships will take the time to learn the preferences of their students regarding preferred recognition methods (public/private, enhanced privileges, etc), and will recognize goals that have been achieved. Darvish and Farzane-dokht (2011) viewed behaviors such as these to be important ways to improve both subordinate support of organizational goals and performance, learning, creativity and cooperation.

Create Opportunities for Competitor Autonomy and Creativity

Forensics coaches have the responsibility to create an organizational culture where students can develop autonomy and creativity. As leaders of a competitive and primarily individual activity, coaches should engage in behaviors that will develop high quality LMX relationships to encourage autonomy and creativity. Volmer, Niessen, Spurk, Linz, and Abele (2011) highlighted the importance of decreasing top-down control and giving subordinates increased levels of decision-latitude as being important for high-quality LMX relationships. While it is tempting to seek authoritarian control over a forensics team, the results of such leadership may negatively influence student and organizational outcomes. For instance, students may lose sight of the goals they and the team as an organization share.

Coaches must encourage competitor autonomy, which can be accomplished in a number of ways. Choosing the tournaments and events in which a student wishes to compete should be primarily driven by the student. Coaches can and should encourage expanding the limitations students place upon themselves (.ie. "I am an interper"), but always with the focus remaining on the autonomy of the competitor first instead of the overall team well-being. When preparing events, coaches should have the patience to allow the students to hone their instincts on cutting a poem or structuring a speech. Providing students with autonomy may result in a mixture of competitive success and failure, but the organizational citizenship behaviors it may elicit will ultimately benefit the organization at large. It may also promote competitor creativity in problem solving. However, Darvish and Farkane-dokht (2011) suggested leaders seeking high-quality LMX relationships must increase their acceptance of ambiguity; if subordinates feel there is too much emphasis on objectivity and certainty, there is little leeway for the subordinates to engage in creative activities. Subordinates who receive support for their use of creative solutions to problems or tasks may feel as though the organization trusts their judgment and may feel more committed to the work they do.

Autonomy should not be encouraged for students without them also taking on responsibilities for the well-being of the team. Darvish and Farkane-dokht (2011) suggested leaders should allow students to determine the methods and tempo for which they wish to complete tasks, but they should also be held responsible for their actions. Students should also be held responsible for how their individual contributions to the team as an organization. Autonomy doesn't mean living within a vacuum; autonomy means getting the perks of more individual freedom but also considering the organization's needs in conjunction with one's own. Bezuijen, van Dam, van den Berg, and Thierry (2010) concluded high-LXM relationships are benefited by specific learning

goals and specific feedback, which are easily incorporated into a coach-competitor relationship. For example, students should be given some control over tournament planning details. Coaches can discuss with students the framework of what must happen and what resources are available for traveling to a tournament, but then turn the reins over to the students to determine the details. Delegating tasks may be another beneficial way to increase levels of decision latitude (Truckenbrodt, 2000). Meetings and coaching sessions are also excellent places where students can make determinations for how the time will best be spent. At the very least, input on the meeting or tournament details processes allow students to be involved in the organizational decision making, increasing the potential for high-quality LMX relationships. Doing so suggests trust in and respect for their ability to make good decisions, as well as providing them a situation where they feel an obligation to rise to the situation.

CONCLUSION

Forensic coaches do many of the actions suggested here, but this article provides the link for the professionals in this field to connect theory to practice. With a better grasp of LMX theory, forensic professionals can use the theory to help increase the organizational positive outcomes of their team by having a high-quality relationship with one's subordinates. LMX theory offers a framework to examine forensic leadership; how a coach approaches leading students tends to be far more nebulous. While it is easy to view relationships in a dyad (high/low quality or stranger/maturity stage), forensic relationships function on a continuum and act as a process. Forensic professionals should keep in mind all relationships are subject to growth and regression, and should be treated as such.

Of course, this only examines forensic leadership on the theoretical level. Since research is sparse in this area, future research should explore how forensic coaches actually lead their teams to determine effective strategies which may or may not link theory with praxis. Different coaches may take a variety of approaches on a scale of LMX behaviors such as the ones suggested in this paper and come to some leadership gains not anticipated. Ideally, further discussion for leadership studies in forensics will explore related concepts such as the long term effects of a high/low-quality LMX relationship on retention and faster career progression as well as examining followership from the standpoint of students. The more perspectives we gather through an organizational lens in forensics, the better our teams and leadership strategies can be for the future of this activity.

REFERENCES

Bauer, T. N. & Green, S.G. (1996). Development of leader-member exchange: A longitudinal test. *Academy of Management Journal, 39*(6), 1538-1567.

Bezuijen, X. M., van Dam, K., van den Berg, P. T., & Thierry, H. (2010). How leaders stimulate employee learning: A leader–member exchange approach. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 83*, 673–693. doi:10.1348/096317909X468099

Cashman, J., Dansereau Jr., F., Graen, G., & Haga, W. J. (1976). Organizational understructure and leadership: A longitudinal investigation of the managerial role-making process. *Organizational Behavior & Human Performance*, *15*(2), 278-296.

Dansereau, F., Graen, G., & Haga, W. (1975). A vertical dyad linkage approach to leadership in formal organizations. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 13*, 46-78.

Darvish, H. & Farzane-dokht, N. (2011). Studying the effect of leader-member exchange in creating energy and creativity at workplace: A case study at Alzahra University. *International Journal of Academic Research, 3*(2), 1252-1259.

Dienesch, R. M. & Liden, R. C. (1986). Leader-member exchange model of leadership: A critique and further development. *Academy of Management Review, 11*(3), 618-634.

Dreibelbis, G. (1989). The director of forensics, assistant director and staff: An organizational communication perspective. *National Forensics Journal, 7*(1), 63-70.

Eisenberg, E. M., & Riley, P. (2001). Organizational culture. In F. M. Jablin, & L. L. Putnam (Eds.), *The new handbook of organizational com-munication* (pp. 292-322). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Fairhurst, G.T., & Hamlett, S.R.. (2003). "The Narrative Basis of Leader-Member Exchange." *LMX, the Series, Vol. 1*. Ed. G. Graen. Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing. 117-144.

Ferris, G. R. (1985). Role of leadership in the employee withdrawal process: A constructive replication. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 70*, 777–781.

Fisk, G. M. & Friesen, J. P. (2012). Perceptions of leader emotion regulation and LMX as predictors of followers' job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behaviors. *The Leadership Quarterly, 23*, 1-12.

Friedley, S.A., & Manchester, B.B. (2005). Building team cohesion: Becoming "We" instead of "Me". *National Forensics Journal, 23*(1), 95-100.

Gertsner, C. R. & Day, D. V. (1997). Meta-analytic review of leader-member exchange theory: Correlates and construct issues. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82*(6), 827-844.

Graen, G. B., & Cashman, J. F. (1975). *A role making model of leadership in formal organizations: A developmental approach*. Kent, OH: Kent State University Press.

Graen, G. B., Novak, M., & Sommerkamp, P. (1982). The effects of leader-member exchange and job design on productivity and satisfaction: Testing a dual attachment model. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 30*(1), 109-131.

Graen, G., & Uhl-Bien, M. (1995). Relationship-based approach to leadership: Development of leader-member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25 years: Applying a multi-level, multi-domain perspective. *Leadership Quarterly, 6*(2), 219-247.

Hinck, E. (2003). Managing the dialectical tension between competition and education in forensics: A response to Burnett, Brand and Meister. *National Forensic Journal*, *21*(2), 60-76.

House, R. & Aditya, R. (1997). The social scientific study of leadership: Quo vadis? *Journal of Management*, *23*(3), 409-473.

Jones, J. A. (2009). Gender dissimilarity and leader-member exchange: The mediating effect of communication apprehension. *Emerging Leadership Journeys, 1*(2), 3-16.

Madlock, P. E., Martin, M. M., Bogdan, L., & Ervin, M. (2007). The impact of communication traits on leader-member exchange. *Human Communication*, *10*, 451-464.

McClane, W. E. (1991). The interaction of leader and member characteristics in the leader-member exchange (LMX) model of leadership. *Small Group Research*, *22*, 283–300. doi:10.1177/1046496491223001

McCroskey, J. C. (1977). Oral communication apprehension: A summary of recent theory and research. *Human Communication Research, 31*(1), 78-96.

Miller, J. B. (2005). Coast to coast and culture to culture: An intercultural perspective on regional differences in forensics pedagogy and practice. *National Forensic Journal, 23*(2), 1-18.

Mowday, R. T., Steers, R. M., & Porter, L. W. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *14*, 224-247.

Northouse, P. (2004). *Leadership: Theory and practice*. London: SAGE publications.

Ostroff, C. (1992). The relationship between satisfaction, attitudes, and performance: An organizational-level analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 77*, 963–974.

Scandura, T. A., & Graen, G. B. (1984). Moderating effects of initial leader-member exchange status on the effects of a leadership intervention. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 69*, 428–436.

Scandura, T. A., Graen, G. B., & Novak, M. A. (1986). When managers decide not to decide autocratically: An investigation of leader-member exchange and decision influence. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 71*, 579-584.

Scott, S. G., & Bruce, R. A. (1994). Determinants of innovative behavior: A path model of individual innovation in the workplace. *Academy of Management Journal, 37*, 580–607.

Sears, G. J. & Hackett, R. D. (2011). The influence of role definition and affect in LMX: A process perspective on the personality – LMX relationship. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 84*, 544–564.

Smith, R., & Smoll, F. (1990). Self-esteem and children's reactions to youth sport coaching behaviors: A field study of self-enhancement processes. *Development Psychology, 26,* 987-993.

Swanson, D. (1992). Forensics as a laboratory in organizational communication. *National Forensics Journal, 10*(1), 65-76.

Truckenbrodt, Y. B. (Summer, 2000). The relationship between leader-member exchange and commitment and organizational citizenship behavior. *Acquisition Review Quarterly,* 233-244.

Turman, P. (2001). Situational coaching styles: The impact of success and athlete maturity level on coaches' leadership styles over time. *Small Group Research*, *32*, 576–594.

Turman, P., & Schrodt, P. (2004). New avenues for instructional communication research: Relationships among coaches' leadership behaviors and athletes' affective learning. *Communication Research Reports, 21,* 130-143.

Tzy-Yuan, C., Jiang, J. J., Klein, G., & Chou, S. T. (2011). Organizational Citizenship Behavior of Information System Personnel: The Influence of Leader-Member Exchange. *Information Resources Management Journal*, *24*(4), 77-93.

Volmer, J., Niessen, C., Spurk, D, Linz, A., Abele, A. E. (2011). Reciprocal relationships between leader–member exchange (LMX) and job satisfaction: A cross-lagged analysis. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, *60* (4), 522–545. doi: 10.1111/j.1464-0597.2011.00446.x

Volmer, J., Spurk, D. and Niessen, C. (2012). Leader–member exchange (LMX), job autonomy, and creative work involvement. *The Leadership Quarterly, 23*, 456-465.

Walker, B. (2011). Connecting to students: Self-disclosure as a motivational tool for collegiate forensic coaches. *Communication and Theatre Association of Minnesota Journal*, *38*, 28-41.

Walumbwa, F. O., Cropanzano, R., & Goldman, B. M. (2011). How leader-member exchange influences effective work behaviors: Social exchange and internal-external efficacy perspectives. *Personnel Psychology*, *64*(3), 739-770.

Wayne, S. J., Liden, R. C., & Sparrowe, R. T. (1994). Developing leader-member exchanges: The influence of gender and ingratiation. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *37*, 697-714.

Wayne, S. J., Shore, L. M., & Liden, R. C. (1997). Perceived organizational support and leader-member exchange: A social exchange perspective. *Academy of Management Journal, 40,* 82-111.

White, L. (2005). The coach as mentor. *National Forensic Journal*, *23*(1), 89-94.

Worthen, T. (1995). Creating a team culture. *Speaker Points, 2*(1).

Zhang, J., & Jensen, B. E. (1997). Modification and revision of the leadership scale for sport. *Journal of Sport Behavior, 20,* 105-122.

Stress, Burnout, Job Satisfaction, and Intent to Leave Among Collegiate Forensic Educators

Heather J. Carmack
James Madison University

Todd T. Holm
Marine Corps University

The purpose of this study is to explore how burnout, stress, and job satisfaction impact coaches' intention to leave forensics. Some 111 collegiate forensics educators completed a survey examining workplace stress, burnout, job satisfaction, and perceived intent to leave forensics. Coaches who had thought about leaving forensics reported being more emotionally exhausted than coaches who had not thought about leaving. Female coaches also reported more stress than male coaches. Although many educators feel stressed, burned out, and have thought about leaving, they were still satisfied with their jobs as educators. The article concludes with a discussion of the findings and implications of the research.

The health of forensics is dependent on the physical, emotional, and psychological health of its coaches. Leland (2004) characterized how absurd the job of Director of Forensics sounds when he explained it to his doctor: seven-day work weeks, 16-hour days, 40 to 60 days or more on the road staying in cheap hotels, eating fast food, driving hundreds of miles late at night, all in addition to the teaching, research, and service expectations of a full-time faculty member. It is a hard lifestyle, but for many, an extremely rewarding life. Some coaches manage to live that life for 20 or 30 years, a few even more. But for many, the rigors of the job have them pursuing other career options within just a few years. Human resources are one of the most important commodities in the forensic community, and it is important that we understand the issue of forensics educator burnout, its contributing factors, and the factors that mitigate the threat of burnout that would ultimately increase career longevity, stability in the forensic community, and work toward a higher quality of life for forensics coaches at all levels.

As communication scholars continue to explore the nuances of workplace stressors, burnout, and job satisfaction, we must consider the unique job elements of forensic educators. Although researchers have explored these workplace issues in a variety of teaching and coaching experiences (Dale & Weinberg, 1989; Kertz-Welzel, 2009; Leland, 2004; Nikolaos, 2012; Raedeke, Granzyk, & Warren, 2000; Richardson, 2005; Tashman, Tenenbaum, & Eklund, 2010), we have remained relatively silent about the issues impacting forensic educators (Gill, 1990; Littlefield & Sellnow, 1992; Preston, 1995), nor have we attempted to explore the interrelationships between stress, burnout, satisfaction, and intent to leave. The purpose of this study is to explore whether burnout,

stress, and job satisfaction impact coaches' intention to leave forensics. We begin by first laying out a more thorough overview of workplace stressors, workplace burnout, and job satisfaction, highlighting the unique role that coaching forensics and teaching may have on how coaches experience these issues. After explaining our methodology, we report on a study of the interrelationship of, and differences among, these factors. We conclude with a discussion of the findings and recommendations for future research.

Workplace Stress, Burnout, and Job Satisfaction

Workplace Stress
Forensic educators are often presented with a variety of stressors that impact their ability to provide quality coaching to team members as well as a meaningful educational experience for their classroom students. Although not all coaches also have teaching responsibilities, forensic educators at most institutions are required to coach and teach. Workplace stress is the presence of strain on the physical, mental, or emotional wellbeing of workers (Miller, Zook, & Ellis, 1989). Workplace stress is the result of excess—too much work, too much pressure to perform, too many commitments (Vorell, Carmack, & Scarduzio, in press).

Forensic educators must deal with stresses found in the work environment, including behavioral, attitudinal, emotional, interpersonal, and physical stresses (Kahill, 1988). The first stress, behavioral stress, includes increased absenteeism, high turnover rates, and excessive and unhealthy consumption behaviors, such as drug and alcohol abuse (Baker, O'Brien, & Salahuddin, 2007; Kovoacs, Kovoacs, & Hegedus, 2010; Lemaire & Wallace, 2010). The second stress, attitudinal, manifests in negative thoughts and hostility towards others (Marshall & Kasman, 1980). Emotional stress is the third type of workplace stress. Here, workers experience frustration, irritability, anxiety, depression, and a sense of helplessness (Quattrin, Zanini, Nascig, Annunziata, Calligaris, & Brusaferro, 2006; Schneider, 1997). The fourth stress is interpersonal stress, which occurs when workers have to have difficult conversations with others. This is an extremely important workplace stressor for forensic educators because difficult conversations are an everyday part of forensics. Educators must help students make sense of ballots, performances, and the difficulties associated with finding and writing scripts. They also work extended hours in close proximity with a small group, opening up space for an increase in interpersonal interactions and stress. The final stress is physical stress, where workers corporeally experience stress. These physical ailments can be as mundane as a headache, stomach aches, and sweaty palms, or as serious as elevated blood pressure, chest pain, and chronic migraines (Chipas & McKenna, 2011). If left untreated, these physical stresses can lead back to the other stresses, underscoring the interconnectedness of workplace stress.

Burnout
Constantly dealing with workplace stressors can lead to burnout. Burnout is the physical and emotional reaction resulting from prolonged exposure to stress at work (Isaksson Ro, Tyssen, Hoffart, Secton, Aasland, & Gude, 2010). Individuals who experience burnout often lack creativity and imagination in the ways in which they approach work (Marshall & Kasman, 1980). Burnout is comprised of four dimensions: depersonalization,

emotional exhaustion, loss of personal accomplishment, and cynicism (Williams, 1989). Prolonged exposure to any of these elements can result in burnout.

Emotional exhaustion occurs when workers feel worn out, fatigued, and have a loss of energy and empathy (Evans, Bryant, Owens, & Koukos, 2004). In this element of burnout, workers often experience feelings of depression, anger, frustration, and general dissatisfaction with work (Zhang & Zhu, 2007, 2008). Emotional exhaustion may be the result of role overload and uncertainty in work responsibilities (Wu, Zhu, Wang, Wang, & Lan 2007), both of which are likely major stressors for forensic educators. Depersonalization involves the dehumanization of individuals (Zhang & Zhu, 2007, 2008). Workers who experience depersonalization may feel emotionally distant from the people with whom they work (Baker et al., 2007) and treat those people like objects.

Another element of burnout is the loss of personal accomplishment. Loss of personal accomplishment is accompanied by feelings of failure and work inadequacy. The make-up of work, such as not having enough time to complete work or having too much work to do, also contributes to feelings of failure, as workers are not able to complete their goals (Baker et al., 2007). This further reinforces the loss of personal accomplishment and ability to successfully work. This may be especially problematic for forensic educators as they may begin to question their ability to successfully coach and teach students. Depersonalization, emotional exhaustion, and loss of personal accomplishment lead to the final element of burnout: cynicism. Workers who are burnt out often have a negative, cold, and unsympathetic view of the job and the people at the organization (Maslach, 2003). As Maslach (2003) pointed out, cynicism is often left out of the burnout equation: however, it represents a "basic hallmark of the burnout experience" (p. 190). This element of burnout is important when talking about burnout among forensic educators, because students may expect coaches to be warm, caring, and able to empathize with their struggles with writing speeches, finding outstanding scripts, memorizing, performing, and balancing school and competition. Forensic educators who are cynical about their work may not be able to meet those student expectations.

Educators are especially vulnerable to burnout (Farber, 1991), often a result of dealing with stress caused by a number of interpersonal and organizational factors, such as interactions with students, parents, and administration and trying to meet the demands of learning outcomes. Most communication research focusing on burnout and education focuses on K-12 teachers because of the intense levels of burnout and turnover reported by teachers (Tevan, 2007). Educators report a number of reasons they experience burnout, must most of their responses are focused on two specific issues: work overload (too many work responsibilities) and role stress (incompatibility between an individual's and organization's job expectations) (Dillon & Tanner, 1995). Teachers also report that their burnout is caused by role conflict (problems caused by competing roles) and role ambiguity (lack of clarity about expectations), especially when they take on activities outside the classroom (Zhang & Zhu, 2007). These are coupled with an emphasis on the "caring teacher temperament" students, parents, and the general public expect of teachers, which created an added emotional burden for educators (Avgtis & Rancer, 2008; Tevan, 2007). Although most communication research focuses on K-12 teachers, it is reasonable to assume that forensic educators would also experience similar issues.

Stress, Burnout, and Gender

The socially constructed nature of gender roles may have an impact on how men and women perceive, process, and endure work related stressors and burnout. Unfortunately, results from studies exploring stress, burnout, and gender have produced inconsistent, and sometimes contradictory, results. Across a variety of occupations, researchers have found that women report significantly higher levels of emotional exhaustion (Caccese & Mayerberg, 1984; Innstrand, Langballe, Falkum, & Aasland, 2011; Pastore & Judd, 1993; Purvanova & Muros, 2010). A number of reasons have been posited for why women report higher levels of emotional exhaustion, including responding differently to emotionally charged work events and level of engagement required for their professions, many of which are "caring professions," the double workload of work and home, and gender inequality at work (Innstrand et al., 2011; McCarthy, Zhao, & Garland, 2007). Conversely, men report significantly higher levels of depersonalization (Innstrand et al., 2011), potentially a result of compartmentalizing emotions, which can cause men to look at others as objects (Houkes, Winants, Twellaar, & Verdonk, 2011).

The inconsistency for gender and burnout arises from the few studies specific to the study of higher education and academics. This line of research focuses either on academics in "traditional" academic roles (research and teaching) or on individuals in administrative roles. Researchers studying academics and individuals working at universities have found there are no significant differences between men and women when it comes to any elements of emotional exhaustion (Adekola, 2012; Doyle & Hind, 1998; McCann & Holt, 2009). Adekola (2012) did find that male university workers did report significantly higher levels of depersonalization than female workers. Gender is clearly an important factor in burnout, but it is unclear what role it plays for forensic educators. As individuals who are often participating in both academic and administrative roles, the inconsistency between research on gender, stress, and burnout among forensic coaches is cause for study.

Job Satisfaction and Intent to Leave

Job satisfaction is directly affected by job stress and burnout (Brown & Peterson, 1993). From an organizational standpoint, job satisfaction is the extent to which a worker has positive or negative feelings about his/her job (Hunt, Chonko, & Wood, 1985). Specific to working at a university, a variety of issues impact a worker's level of job satisfaction, including working conditions (Bellamy, Morley, & Watty, 2003), salary and benefits (Terpstra & Honoree, 2004), and promotions (Witt & Nye, 1992). Communication scholars have identified specific communication elements affecting job satisfaction, including the workplace's communication climate (Brief, Butcher, & Roberson, 1995; Trombetta & Rogers, 1988) and supervisory leadership (Madlock, 2008; Richmond, McCroskey, & Davis, 1982; Wheeless et al., 1984).

An unfortunate outcome of burnout, stress, and low job satisfaction is the intention to leave the job. Although intention to leave does not mean that workers *will* leave, researchers consider workers' intention to leave as an incredibly strong predictor of actual turnover (Brown & Peterson, 1993; Liou, 2009; Mobley, Griffeth, Hand, & Meglino, 1979; Randall, 1990; Shore, Newton, & Thornton, 1990). Burnout is directly

related to intention to leave a position; workers who report experiencing extremely high levels of burnout also report considering leaving their current positions, stating that this may be the only way to truly alleviate their burnout (Moore, 2000). In particular, Moore (2000) found that emotional exhaustion played a critical role in perceived intent to leave.

Communication plays a pivotal role in workers' intentions to leave their current jobs (Apker, Propp, & Zabava Ford, 2009; Scott et al. 1999). Positive communication climates, especially climates where workers feel they can communicate problems with their supervisors, contribute to workers' desire to stay. Conversely, employees working in aggressive or negative communication climates where they feel they cannot talk about job stress or problems are more likely to leave (Richmond & McCroskey, 2008). Rather than simply focusing on intention to leave, it is extremely important for organizations to identify why workers would want to stay with an organization in the face of stress and burnout. Not surprisingly, workers who are committed to either their work or the organization are more likely to stay with an organization (Johnston, Parasuraman, Futrell, & Black, 1990).

Stress and Burnout in Forensics

Whether through anecdotal accounts during off rounds at a tournament, conference papers, or published research studies, stress, burnout, and organizational exit from forensics have been topics of concern for the forensics community (Richardson, 2005). A small number of empirical studies have attempted to piece together the complex puzzle of forensic coach stress and burnout (Gill, 1990; Littlefield & Sellnow, 1992; Preston, 1995), focusing primarily on causes or factors which contribute to coach stress and burnout. Gill (1990) found that as time commitments, travel demands, and the activity's competitive standards increased, coaches reported lower satisfaction with their participation in forensics. Whereas Gill identified specific stressors for participants to rate, Littlefield and Sellnow (1992) asked coaches to identify what they felt were stressors contributing to burnout and the poor health of coaches. Participants in Littlefield and Sellnow's study found that tournament scheduling (hosting and traveling) contributed the most to stress and burnout; more importantly, scheduling often leads to other stressors, such as poor eating habits/options and lack of sleep. The length of the competitive season was also found to be a major source of burnout for participants in Preston's (1995) study of coach burnout.

These studies provide glimpses into stress and burnout among forensic educators; however, they are mostly limited to identifying stressors, descriptive statistics, or the use of author-created measures with low reliability. As Preston (1995) and, later Richardson (2005) in his theoretical discussion of burnout, argued, forensic researchers need to turn to validated measures, such as the Maslach Burnout Inventory, in order to more thoroughly investigate these issues and assess coach burnout. This study does just that, turning to validated measures designed specifically to study workplace stress, burnout, and job satisfaction to evaluate forensic coaches' perceived levels of stress, burnout, job satisfaction, and intent to leave the activity. The lack of empirical research on forensics educator job stress, burnout, and job satisfaction serves as a beginning for a large scale study of identifying workplace stressors, burnout, and social support for forensic

educators. Based on the lack of research, coupled with the literature presented, we posit the following hypotheses:

> H_1: There are significant differences in perceived levels of stress, burnout, and job satisfaction between educators who have thought about leaving forensics and educators who have not thought about leaving forensics.
>
> H_2: There are significant differences in perceived levels of stress, burnout, and job satisfaction between female forensic educators and male forensic educators.
>
> H_3: There is a significant negative relationship between burnout and job satisfaction for forensics educators.
>
> H_4: There is a significant negative relationship between stress and job satisfaction for forensics educators.
>
> H_5: There is a significant positive relationship between stress and burnout for forensics educators.

METHODS

Participants

This study is part of a larger mixed methods research project exploring the health and wellness of collegiate forensic coaches. After receiving university IRB approval, collegiate forensic educators were contacted via blinded mass e-mail, postings on social media sites, and forensics and communication list-servs. The blinded mass e-mail list was compiled in October 2012 by using the list of college programs on the Council of Forensic Organizations website. This website lists colleges and universities with competitive programs in individual events, policy debate, International Parliamentary Debate Association (IPDA), American Parliamentary Debate Association (APDA), National Parliamentary Debate Association (NPDA), World's Style parliamentary debate, Lincoln-Douglas debate, National Education Debate Association (NEDA), and Readers' Theater. As of October 2012, the list contained 450 programs. Some 103 programs were removed because of the lack of a website or coach contact information, leaving a mass e-mail list of 347. Coaches interested in participating were directed to a Qualtrics link to the survey. Participants did not need to indicate how they heard about the survey.

A total of 111 collegiate forensic educators completed the online survey. Participants represented a representative convenience sample; the study targeted collegiate forensics coaches, which all participants were, and participants randomly self-selected to participate in the study. Of the educators who participated, 65 were male (58.5%) and 46 were female (41.4%). Ages ranged from 20 to 64 years, with a majority of participants' ages between 25 and 34 (n = 39, 35%) and 35 to 44 (n = 40, 36%). Participants were predominantly Caucasian (n = 105, 94.5%), with one person identifying as Hispanic, and five participants identifying as African American. A majority of participants had earned a Master's degree (n = 64) or doctoral degree (n =40); five participants had completed a Bachelor's degree and two participants had completed a professional degree (JD, MD). A majority of participants were married with children (n = 49); others were married without children (n = 26), or were single, never married (n = 22). Nine participants were living with a partner, four were divorced, and one participant was widowed.

Participants held a number of ranks in the academy with a majority identifying as instructors (n =52). Seventeen participants were tenure-track assistant professors, 15 were associate professors, and 12 were full professors. Six educators identified themselves as adjunct instructors and eight participants were graduate students (one participant chose not to answer). Participants' teaching obligations widely varied, with most teaching three to four classes a semester (n = 50), followed by educators who taught one to two classes a semester (n = 47); A smaller minority (n = 12) taught five or more classes a semester and two coaches indicated they did not teach classes at all. Seventy-five coaches received one or more course releases; thirty-six participants said they did not receive a course release.

Participants represented a variety of forensic jobs, with 66 participants indicating they were the Director of Forensics, followed by 15 who were the Assistant Directors of Forensics. Several participants had even more specific titles, including Director of Debate (n = 4), Director of Individual Events (n = 6), Assistant Director of Debate (n = 2), and Assistant Director of Individual Events (n = 2). Two participants held the title of Graduate Coaching Assistant. Fourteen participants identified other titles, including Forensics Coordinator, Volunteer Assistant, and Convener of Debates. Participants had been coaching for a number of years, with most coaching between four and six years (n = 24), seven and nine years (n = 22), and 10 and 15 years (n = 22).

A large number of participants had also been coaching for between 16 and 20 years (n =11) and more than 20 years (n = 21). The participants were also offering multiple range of coaching hours a week; 54 coaches were offering 11 or more coaching hours a week, followed by 3-4 hours a week (n = 15), 7-8 hours a week (n =15), 5-6 hours a week (n = 11), and 9-10 hours a week (n =10). Five coaches only offered 1-2 hours of coaching week, and one coach offered less than 1 hour a week. A small portion of coaches were at the beginning of their careers, either in their first year of coaching (n = 6) or coaching between one and three years (n = 5). Many coaches had help coaching from volunteer coaches, a paid staff, or graduate student assistants; 42 participants have one to two additional coaches on their team, 25 coaches have three or four additional coaches, and 22 coaches have 5 or more coaches. Twenty-two coaches were the only coaches for their teams.

Instrumentation

Perceived job stress: Forensics educators' perceived stress was assessed using the Global Measure of Perceived Stress (Cohen, Karmack, & Mermelstein, 1983). The 14-item measure uses a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from "never" to "very often" and asks participants to reflect on daily stressful events. Participants were asked questions such as "In the last month, how often have you felt nervous and stressed?" and "In the last month, how often have you felt that you were on top of things?" Seven items were reverse coded before summation. Cronbach's alpha was high at .85 ($M = 2.84$, $SD = .51$). The Global Measure of Perceived Stress was recently used to assess job stress and communication for medical residents on late-night call (Passalacqua & Segrin, 2012).

Perceived job burnout: The Maslach Burnout Inventory (Maslach, Jackson, & Leiter, 1996) was used to measure forensics coaches' perceived job burnout. The Burnout Inventory is a 22-item scale with three subscales (emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal achievement). The measure uses a 7-point scale ranging

from "never experienced" to "every day" and includes prompts such as "I feel like I'm at   the end of my rope," "I worry that this job is hardening me emotionally," and "In my work, I deal with emotional problems very quickly." Eight items were reverse coded before summation of the subscales and before calculating a composite score for burnout. Reliability for the subscales emotional exhaustion (α, = .915, M = 3.69, SD = 1.29), depersonalization (α =.789, M = 2.36, SD = 1.08), and personal achievement (α = .834, M = 2.39, SD = .84) were all moderate to high. The Maslach Burnout Inventory has recently been successfully used to study communication and burnout among domestic violence advocates (Babin, Palazzolo, & Rivera, 2012) and healthcare workers (Wright, Banas, Bessarabova, & Bernard, 2010).

Perceived job satisfaction: Coaches' perceived job satisfaction was assessed using the Generalized Belief Model about Job Satisfaction (McCroskey & Richmond, 1996). This 5-item measure uses a 7-point bipolar-adjective response format. Participants were asked to rate the statement "I am satisfied with my job" using adjectives such as "Agree-Disagree" and "Incorrect-Correct." Three items were recoded before scale summation. In this study, the achieved Cronbach's alpha was high at .984 (M = 5.21, SD = 1.66). Porter, Wrench, and Hoskinson (2007) successfully used this scale in their study of supervisor-subordinate communication and job satisfaction among service industry workers.

Perceived intent to leave: To assess participants' consideration of leaving forensics, participants were asked, "Have you thought about leaving forensics (e.g., not coaching)?" Coaches were not asked if they were planning to leave or if they were leaving forensics, only if they had thought about it. This question is based on the perceived intent to leave questions asked by Apker et al. (2009) and Scott et al. (1999) in their studies of intent to leave. Questions used to study perceived intent to leave often focus on consideration or thought participants have given to leaving their present organization or position or if participants would prefer a different job than their current position (Scott, et al., 1999).

Statistical Analysis

Data were analyzed with the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). Independent samples t-tests were performed to determine differences between participants' intent to leave and job satisfaction, burnout, and stress (H_1) and differences between sex and job satisfaction, burnout, and stress (H_2). Table 1 reports the means and standard deviations for participants' intent to leave the job and satisfaction, burnout, and stress. Table 2 reports the means and standard deviations for sex and satisfaction, burnout, and stress. Pearson product-moment correlations were calculated to determine relationships between pairwise combinations of job satisfaction, stress, and burnout (H_3, H_4, and H_5).

Table 1

Means and Standard Deviations for Coaches' Responses to Stress, Burnout, and Job Satisfaction

	N	M of coaches who thought about leaving forensics	SD	M of coaches who have not thought about leaving forensics	SD
Stress	58	2.88	.573	2.58	.438
Burnout-Emotional Exhaustion	60	3.98	1.30	3.02	1.39
Burnout-Depersonalization	60	2.64	1.05	2.20	1.22
Burnout-Personal Accomplishment	60	2.47	.719	2.09	1.06
Job Satisfaction	57	5.13	1.61	5.95	1.39

Table 2

Means and Standard Deviations for Male and Female Responses to Stress, Burnout, and Job Satisfaction

	N	Male M	SD	Female M	SD
Stress	107	2.76	.544	2.99	.451
Burnout-Emotional Exhaustion	111	3.60	1.37	3.84	1.24
Burnout-Depersonalization	111	2.41	1.08	2.35	1.13
Burnout-Personal Accomplishment	111	2.48	.759	2.29	.952
Job Satisfaction	107	5.34	1.67	4.96	1.63

RESULTS

The first hypothesis posited that there would be significant differences of perceived stress, burnout, and job satisfaction between coaches who had thought about leaving forensics and coaches who had not thought about leaving forensics. Independent sample

t-tests revealed that coaches who had thought about leaving forensics did report significantly higher feelings of emotional exhaustion (t(58)= -2.464; p<.01) than coaches who had not thought about leaving. However, coaches who had thought about leaving forensics did not report significantly higher levels of stress (t(56)= -1.890; p>.05), feelings of depersonalization (t(58)= -1.360; p>.05) and loss of personal accomplishment (t(58)= -1.600; p>.05). Those who thought about leaving also did not report significantly less job satisfaction (t(55)= 1.793; p>.05). This hypothesis was mostly not supported.

We were also interested in sex differences and stress, burnout, and job satisfaction. The second hypothesis stated that there would be significant differences in perceived stress, burnout, and job satisfaction between female coaches and male coaches. Independent sample t-tests revealed that female educators were significantly more stressed (t(107)= -2.329; p<.05) than male educators. Female coaches were also less satisfied (t(105)=1.186 ; p>.05) and more emotionally exhausted (t(109)= -.961; p>.05) than male coaches, while male coaches reported experiencing higher levels of depersonalization (t(109)= .254; p>.05) and loss of personal accomplishments (t(109)= .414; p>.05). However, these differences were not statistically significant. This hypothesis was also mostly not supported.

Hypotheses 3, 4, and 5 proposed that there are negative relationships between burnout and job satisfaction (H_3), stress and job satisfaction (H_4), and a positive relationship between stress and burnout (H_5). As indicated by Table 3, significant negative correlations were observed between emotional exhaustion and job satisfaction (r[109] = -.662, p < .00), depersonalization and job satisfaction (r[109] = -.423, p < .00), loss of personal accomplishment and job satisfaction (r[109] = -.273, p < .00), and stress and job satisfaction (r[107] = -.522, p < .00). A significant positive correlation was observed between stress and emotional exhaustion (r[111] = .623, p < .00), personal accomplishment (r[111] = .411, p < .00), and depersonalization (r[111] = .376, p < .00). All of these hypotheses were supported. It is interesting to note that emotional exhaustion was the most significantly correlated with both job satisfaction and stress, followed by personal accomplishment, and finally depersonalization.

Table 3
Correlations Coefficients for Stress, Burnout, and Job Satisfaction

	1	2	3	4	5
1. Stress	---	-.522**	.623**	.376**	.411**
2. Job Satisfaction		---	-.662**	-.423**	-.273**
3. Burnout-Emotional Exhaustion			---	.474**	.280**
4. Burnout-Depersonalization				---	.349**
5. Burnout-Personal Accomplishment					---

** Correlation significant at .01 and .00 level (1-tailed)

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to explore the relationships between forensic educator stress, burnout, job satisfaction, and intent to leave forensics. The results of this study were mixed. Although some significant differences were found (female coaches are more stressed than male coaches and coaches who have thought about leaving forensics report more emotional exhaustion than those that have not considered leaving), the majority of results suggest there are no significant differences of perceived stress, burnout, and job satisfaction between educators who had thought about leaving forensics and those who had not thought about leaving forensics. Likewise, male and female educators did not report significant differences between perceived burnout and job satisfaction, but female coaches were significantly more stressed. All of the correlations were significant. The results show that coaches who report higher levels of stress also feel more burnt out and less satisfied than those who report lower levels of stress. Support for these hypotheses is consistent with previous research looking at the relationships between stress, burnout, and job satisfaction in other fields. The lack of significant findings between male and female educators, and those who had thought about leaving forensics and those that had not considered leaving forensics is interesting; these non-significant findings offer insight as well as opportunities for recommendations to help alleviate stress and burnout.

Of the educators who responded, 73% (n = 44) said they had thought about leaving forensics. For those educators, emotional exhaustion was reported as a major element of burnout and the only statistically significant difference between those who thought about leaving and those who did not. One explanation for this finding could be that individuals who are more attuned to their emotional states would more likely notice emotional exhaustion, and think about leaving forensics in order to preserve their emotional state. Individuals with high emotional IQs are able to relieve stress, communicate effectively, and be more productive workers (Snyder, 2012). Snyder (2012), in his exploration of empathic communication, burnout, and healthcare workers, identified emotional intelligence as an important factor for successful communication responsiveness. Workers who are more communicatively responsive are usually more positive about their work and experience less emotional exhaustion.

Another reason for this significant finding could be because of workload, which is also tied directly to emotional exhaustion. Gill's (1990) study of coaches found that the time commitments required for forensics was a leading cause of exit from coaching. Many of the elements of emotional exhaustion can be tied directly to time commitments, and the results of spending too much time on coaching. Although educators may not experience uncertainty in their work responsibilities (most coaches are aware of the coaching and logistical requirements of the job), coaching and teaching can lead to role overload. As we have argued since the opening of this article, many forensic educators are required to complete the requirements of a full-time faculty member (instructor and tenure-track/tenured) *and* run a team, which may include coaching, handling administrative duties, and coordinating with assistant coaches and graduate assistants. Essentially, some forensics educators find themselves holding down two full-time jobs: one as college instructor, one as forensics coach/administrator. Finding the time to do all the activities required of both jobs can lead to feelings of fatigue and a loss of energy.

Although there were limited significant differences between the identified groups, it is important to note that, in general, forensic educators report moderate to high levels of stress and burnout, but also high levels of job satisfaction. The high stress job filled with bad food and bad wellness options described by Leland (2004) is apparently also a very satisfying job. The question that follows, then, is if forensic educators report being stressed and burnt out, why are they also extremely satisfied with their jobs? The limited research directly exploring stress, burnout, and job satisfaction report that feelings of stress and burnout often result in lower job satisfaction, especially for individuals in caring professions (Apker et al., 2009). There are a number of possible reasons for this, including the nature of competitive forensics. Coaches in forensics, much like coaches in competitive sports, experience success through the accomplishments their students and their team as a whole. Here, personal accomplishment is conceptualized differently because, for forensic educators, personal achievement comes from their students succeeding (Richardson, 2005). It is important to note that success does not always mean winning; as an educational activity, success could also mean learning and improving. Although coaches may experience feelings of failure and work inadequacy when their students do not break into outrounds or struggle with events, coaches may still experience feelings of personal achievement because their students are learning and growing. Unfortunately, forensic scholars have not yet explored these issues as potential explanations for high job satisfaction in the face of stress and burnout. These findings, however, open the door for future research to explore not only why forensic educators leave but also what educators like about forensics and why they stay.

The lack of differences between male and female coaches was also a striking finding. Past research on workplace stress and burnout suggests there are differences between male and female organizational members (Hill et al., 2008; Innstrand, et al., 2011). The only difference identified in this analysis was that female coaches report significantly higher levels of workplace stress than male coaches. For the female participants in this study, feeling overwhelmed, experiencing a lack of control, and not being able to cope with workplace stress were the highest rated questions. However, our male and female participants did not report significant differences in burnout or job satisfaction. This is complicated by the fact that the results of the correlation analysis found that participants who reported higher levels of stress also reported higher levels of burnout. These findings are similar to Doyle and Hind's (1998) study of male and female academics; in their study, female academics reported higher levels of job stress and strain, but not different levels of burnout. Doyle and Hind's study focused on faculty who only had teaching and research requirements, not on faculty who also had administrative responsibilities. The findings from this study further complicate the idea of stress and burnout by adding the administrative component. Additionally, the female coaches in this study reported significantly higher levels of emotional exhaustion, which contrasts with Doyle and Hind's study of academics.

One explanation for female coaches reporting higher levels of stress could be the gender differences associated with forensics. Differences in gender experiences in forensics is well-documented (Greenstreet & Fredrick, 2000; Greenstreet, Joeckel, Martin, & Piercy, 1998; Pettus & Danielson, 1994), with forensic researchers highlighting issues of sexual harassment, balancing motherhood and coaching, and a lack of support from colleagues as major points of concern for female educators. Even

encouraging women in forensics to participate in studies about forensics can be challenging. Greenstreet and Fredrick (2000) said, in explaining the low return rate for surveys exploring issues of gender in forensics, "many women are so conditioned socially to accepting patriarchy as a normal part of their every day [sic] lives, they do not recognize it as such, but part of normal social interaction" (p. 30). Many of these elements could cause stress, but it is possible that female educators are so accustomed to these issues that they do not see it contributing to burnout. Doyle and Hind (1998) also posit that more stress may come from the "feminine" expectations associated with university teaching: female academics are expected to be more caring and emotionally invested in their students than male academics, which could contribute to more stress. The same conclusion could be the case for female forensic educators if there are different expectations of caring held by their team, their classroom students, and their administration.

Limitation and Areas for Future Research

There are several limitations with the current study. First, the data collected were all self-report data, meaning there is room for human bias. This limitation is tempered because the study's purpose is to explore forensic educators' perceptions of their stress, burnout, and intent to leave, so self-report is appropriate in this instance. However, we do not report other stakeholders' perceptions of coach stress and burnout, including team members, students in educators' courses, other faculty, and administrators. Second, the sample size (111 participants) is a somewhat medium-sized sample given there are approximately 300 active collegiate forensic programs in the country. Finally, although we are able to identify that coaches report high levels of stress and what kind of burnout they experience (emotional exhaustion being the leader), we are not able to explain why this is the case or how coaches make sense of these stressors and burnout.

These limitations lend themselves to a number of future studies. Given the findings of this exploratory study, researchers need to examine the "why" questions associated with stress and burnout, specifically what educators see as the major stressors of coaching and teaching and how they cope with these stressors. Previous research did identify some stressors, such as time (Gill, 1990; Littlefield & Sellnow, 1992; Preston, 1995); however, it would be interesting to see how stressors have changed or not changed in the approximately twenty years since these research studies were conducted.

Researchers can also move beyond a focus on collegiate forensic educators. Issues of stress, burnout, and intent to leave are also important issues for high school forensic educators and should be explored. More research is also needed on the two groups who rest at the ends of the continuum: graduate forensic assistants and retired forensic educators. Although we did not limit our study to directors, assistant directors, and coaches, we only had a small number of participants who identified as graduate assistants. Focusing specifically on graduate assistant experience, such as balancing coursework, coaching, and travel would provide insight for the community as to why some graduate assistants stay with forensics and why others leave. Additionally, we also need to study the experiences of retired forensic educators. Here, retired could include educators who spent their entire careers as forensic educators until they retired from teaching and coaching as well as educators who exit the activity early. Important insight

about these critical issues can be gained from those who have left forensics. Asking those who left the activity about their reasons for leaving, the work they now chose to do, and their current levels of stress can inform the forensics community about effective and ineffective ways of dealing with stressors. Finally, forensic scholars need to explore the organizational and familial support systems set up to help forensic educators deal with the stresses of coaching and teaching.

Forensic educators are members of a caring community, emotionally tied to their work, their students, and their colleagues. Cultivating and grooming forensic educators is a significant investment on the part of the department, college, university, and the forensics community. When we create systems that are not sustainable or viable for healthy long-term professional participation, we need to consider not *what* we are doing, but the *way* in which we do it. The good news is that there are opportunities to create a lower stress, more rewarding job for coaches and teachers. Researching the stressors that lead to forensic educator burnout and using that information to create a work environment that allows for a long and healthy career can bring stability to communication departments, forensics programs, and to the forensics community.

REFERENCES

Adekola, B. (2012). Work burnout experiences among university non-teaching staff: A gender approach. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences, 2*, 128-135. Retrieved from http://hrmars.com/index.php/pages/detail/IJARBSS

Apker, J., Propp, K. M., & Zabava Ford, W. S. (2009). Investigating the effect of nurse-team communication on nurse turnover: Relationships among communication processes, identification, and intent to leave. *Health Communication, 24*, 106-114. doi:10.1080/10410230802676508

Avtgis, T. A., & Rancer, A. S. (2008). The relationship between trait verbal aggression and teacher burnout syndrome in K-12 teachers. *Communication Research Reports, 25*, 86-89. doi: 10.1080/08824090701831875

Babin, E. A., Palazzolo, K. E., & Rivera, K. D. (2012). Communication skills, social support, and burnout among advocates in a domestic violence agency. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 40*, 147-166. doi: 10.1080/00909882.2012.670257

Baker, L. M., O'Brien, K. M., & Salahuddin, N. M. (2007). Are shelter workers burned out?: An examination of stress, social support, and coping. *Journal of Family Violence, 22*, 465-474. doi: 10.1007/s10896-007-9103-1

Bellamy, S., Morley, C., & Watty, K. (2003). Why business academics remain in Australian universities despite deteriorating working conditions and reduced job satisfaction: An intellectual puzzle. *Journal of Higher Education Policy & Management, 25*, 13-28. doi:10.1080/13600800305740

Brief, A. P., Butcher, A. H., & Roberson, L. (1995). Cookies, disposition, and job attitudes: The effects of positive mood-inducing events and negative affectivity on job satisfaction in a field experiment. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 62*, 55-62. http://dx.doi.org/10.1006/obhd.1995.1030

Brown, S. P., & Peterson, R. A. (1993). Antecedents and consequences of salesperson job satisfaction: Meta-analysis and assessment of causal effects. *Journal of Marketing Research, 30*, 63-77. Retrieved from http://www.marketingpower.com/Pages/default.aspx

Caccese, T. M., & Myerberg, C. K. (1984). Gender differences in perceived burnout of college coaches. *Journal of Sport Psychology*, *6*, 279-288.

Chipas, A., & McKenna, D. (2011). Stress and burnout in nurse anesthesia. *AANA Journal, 79*, 122-128. Retrieved from http://www.aana.com/newsandjournal/pages/aanajournalonline.aspx

Cohen, S. Karmack, T., & Mermelstein, R. (1983). A global measure of perceived stress. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 24*, 385–396. Retrieved from http://hsb.sagepub.com/

Dale, J. & Weinberg, R. S. (1989). The relationship between coaches' leadership style and burnout. *The Sport Psychologist, 3*, 1-13. Retrieved from http://journals.humankinetics.com/tsp

Dillon, J. F., & Tanner, G. R. (1995). Dimensions of career burnout among educators. *Journalism and Mass Communication Educator, 50*(2), 4-13. doi: 10.1177/107769589505000201

Doyle, C., & Hind, P. (1998). Occupational stress, burnout, and job status in female academics. *Gender, Work, and Organization, 5,* 67-82. doi: 10.1111/1468-0432.00047

Evans, G. D., Bryant, N. E., Owens, J. S., & Koukos, K. (2004). Ethnic differences in burnout, coping, and intervention acceptability among childcare professionals. *Child and Youth Care Forum, 33*, 349-371. doi:10.1023/B:CCAR.0000043040.54270.dd

Farber, B. A. (1991). *Crisis in education: Stress and burnout in the American teacher*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gill, M. (1990). Why forensic coaches quit: A replication and extension. *The National Forensic Journal, 8*, 179-188. http://www.nationalforensics.org/national-forensic-journal

Greenstreet, R., & Fredrick, T. (2000). The sounds of silence: The gender-based experiences of women in intercollegiate forensics. *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta, 85,* 25-36. Retrieved from Retrieved from http://www.pikappadelta.com/theforensic.html

Greenstreet, R., Joeckel, K., Martin, J., & Piercy, K. (1998). The gender-based experience of women in intercollegiate forensics. *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta, 83,* 1-21. Retrieved from Retrieved from http://www.pikappadelta.com/theforensic.html

Hill, E. J., Jacob, J. I., Shannon, L. L., Brennan, R. T., Blanchard, V. L., & Martinengo, G. (2008). Exploring the relationship of workplace flexibility, gender, and life stage to family-to-work conflict and stress and burnout. *Community, Work, & Family, 11,* 165-181. doi: 10.1080/13668800802027564

Houkes, I., Winants, Y., Twellaar, M., & Verdonk, P. (2011). Development of burnout over time and the causal order of the three dimensions of burnout among male and female GPs: A three-wave panel study. *BMC Public Health, 11*, 240-252. doi:10.1186/1471-2458-11-240.

Hunt, S. D., Chonko, L. B., & Wood, V. R. (1985). Organizational commitment and marketing. *Journal of Marketing, 49*, 112-24. Retrieved from http://www.marketingpower.com/Pages/default.aspx

Innstrand, S., Langballe, E., Falkum, E., & Aasland, O. (2011). Exploring within- and between-gender differences in burnout: 8 different occupational groups. *International Archives of Occupational & Environmental Health*, *84*(7), 813-824. doi:10.1007/s00420-011-0667-y

Isaksson Ro, K. E., Tyssen, R., Hoffart, A., Secton, H., Aasland, O. G., & Gude, T. (2010). A three-year cohort study of the relationships between coping, job stress, and burnout after a counseling intervention for help-seeking physicians. *BMC Public Health, 10*, 213-225. doi:10.1186/1471-2458-10-213

Johnston, M., Parasuraman, A., Futrell, C., & Black, W. (1990). A longitudinal assessment of the impact of selected organizational influences on salespeople's organizational commitment during early employment. *Journal of Marketing Research, 27*, 333-344. Retrieved from http://www.marketingpower.com/Pages/default.aspx

Kahill, S. (1988). Symptoms of professional burnout: A review of the empirical evidence. *Canadian Psychology, 29*, 285-297. Retrieved from http://www.apa.org/pubs/journals/cap/

Kertz-Welzel, A. (2009). The philosophy of music education and the burnout syndrome: Female viewpoints on a male school world. *Philosophy of Music Education Review, 17*, 144-161. doi: 10.1353/pme.0.0030

Kovacs, M., Kovacs, E., & Hegedus, K. (2010). Emotion work and burnout: Cross-sectional study of nurses and physicians in Hungry. *Croatian Medical Journal, 51*, 432-442. Retrieved from http://www.cmj.hr/default.aspx?id=9

Leland, C. M. (2004). The health of directors of forensics: Career implications, complications, and issues of concern. *National Forensic Journal, 22*, 12-22. Retrieved from http://www.nationalforensics.org/national-forensic-journal

Lemaire, J. B., & Wallace, J. E. (2010). Not all coping strategies are created equal: A mixed methods study exploring physicians self-reporting coping strategies. *BMC Health Services Research, 10,* 208-219. Retrieved from http://www.biomedcentral.com/bmchealthservres

Littlefield, R. S., & Sellnow, T. L. (1992). Assessing competition and stress: The perceived effect of tournament atmosphere on students and coaches. *National Forensic Journal, 10,* 1-10. Retrieved from http://www.nationalforensics.org/national-forensic-journal

Liou, S. R. (2009). Nurses' intention to leave: Critically analyze the theory of reasoned action and organizational commitment model. *Journal of Nursing Management, 17*, 92-99. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2834.2008.00873.x

Madlock, P. E. (2008). The link between leadership style, communicator competence, and employee satisfaction. *Journal of Business Communication, 45*, 61-78. doi:10.1177/0021943607309351

Marshall, R. E., & Kasman, C. (1980). Burnout in the neonatal intensive care unit. *Pediatrics, 65*, 1161-1165. Retrieved from http://pediatrics.aappublications.org/

Maslach, C. (2003). Job burnout: New directions in research and intervention. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 12*, 189-192. doi:10.1111/1467-8721.01258

Maslach, C., Jackson, S. E., & Leiter, M. P. (1996). *Maslach burnout inventory manual* (3rd ed.). Mountain View, CA: CPP.

McCann, J., & Holt, R. (2009). An exploration of burnout among online university professors. *Journal of Distance Education, 23*(3). Retrieved from http://www.jofde.ca/index.php/jde/article/view/620/979

McCarthy, W. P., Zhao, J. S., & Garland, B. E. (2007). Occupational stress and burnout between male and female police officers. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies and Management, 30*, 672-691. doi: 10.1108/13639510710833938

McCroskey, J. C., & Richmond, V. P. (1996). *Fundamentals of human communication: An interpersonal perspective.* Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.

Miller, K. I., Zook, E. G., & Ellis, B. H. (1989). Occupational differences in the influence of communication on stress and burnout in the workplace. *Management Communication Quarterly, 3*, 166-190. Retrieved from http://mcq.sagepub.com/

Mobley, W. H., Griffeth, R. W., Hand, H. H., & Meglino, B. M. (1979). Review and conceptual analysis of the employee turnover process. *Psychological Bulletin, 86*, 493-522. Retrieved from http://www.apa.org/pubs/journals/bul/index.aspx

Moore, J. E. (2000). One road to turnover: An examination of work exhaustion in technology professionals. *MIS Quarterly, 24*, 141-168. Retrieved from http://www.misq.org/

Nikolaos, A. (2012). An examination of a burnout model in basketball coaches. *Journal of Physical Education and Sport, 12*, 171-179. doi**:**10.7752/jpes.2012.02027

Pastore, D. L., & Judd, M. R. (1993). Gender differences in burnout among coaches of women's athletic teams at 2-year colleges. *Sociology of Sport Journal, 10*, 205-212. Retrieved from http://journals.humankinetics.com/ssj.

Passalacqua, S. A., & Segrin, C. (2012). The effect of resident physician stress, burnout, and empathy on patient-centered communication during the long-call shift. *Health Communication, 27*, 449-456. doi: 10.1080/10410236.2011.606527

Pettus, A. B., & Danielson, M. A. (1994). Coaching intercollegiate debate and raising a family: An analysis of perspectives from women in the trenches. *National Forensic Journal, 11,* 47-53. Retrieved from http://www.nationalforensics.org/national-forensic-journal

Porter, H., Wrench, J. S., & Hoskinson, C. (2007). The influence of supervisor temperament on subordinate job satisfaction and perceptions of supervisor sociocommunicative orientation and approachability. *Communication Quarterly, 55*, 129-153. doi: 10.1080/01463370600998517

Preston, C. T. (1995). Contributory factors to coach burnout and brain drain in forensics: Some suggestions for credibility and activity survival. *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta, 80*(3), 16-22. Retrieved from http://www.pikappadelta.com/theforensic.html

Purvanova, R. K., & Muros, J. P. (2010). Gender differences in burnout: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 77*, 168-185. doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2010.04.006

Quanttrin, R., Zanini, A., Nascig, E., Annunziata, M., Calligaris, L., Brusaferro, S. (2006). Level of burnout among nurses working in oncology in an Italian region. *Oncology Nursing Forum, 33*(4), 815-820. doi: 10.1188/06.ONF.815-820

Raedeke, T. D., Granzyk, T. L., & Warren, A. (2000). Why coaches experience burnout: A commitment perspective. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 22*, 85-105. Retrieved from http://journals.humankinetics.com/jsep

Randall, D. M. (1990). The consequences of organizational commitment: Methodological investigation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 11*, 361-378. doi: 10.1002/job.4030110504

Richardson, R. R. (2005). Burned out or born to run: Research and directives on forensics coach burnout. *National Forensic Journal, 23*, 108-115. Retrieved from http://www.nationalforensics.org/national-forensic-journal

Richmond, V. P., & McCroskey, J. C. (2008). *Organizational communication for survival: Making work, work* (4th ed.). NY: Pearson.

Richmond, V. P., McCroskey, J. C., & Davis, L. M. (1982). Individual differences among employees, management communication style, and employee satisfaction: Replication and extension. *Human Communication Research, 8,* 170-188. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2958.1982.tb00663.x

Schneider, S. A. (1997). Stress and the chemotherapy care professional: Coping through communication. *North Dakota Journal of Speech & Theatre, 10*, 42-51. Retrieved from http://www2.edutech.nodak.edu/ndsta/

Scott, C. R., Connaughton, S. L., Diaz-Saenz, H. R., Maguire, K., Ramirez, R., Richardson, B. … Morgan, D. (1999).The impacts of communication and multiple identification on intent to leave: A multimethodological exploration. *Management Communication Quarterly*, *12*, 400–435. Retrieved from http://mcq.sagepub.com/

Shore, L. M., Newton, L. A., & Thornton, G. C., III (1990). Job and organizational attitudes in relation to employee behavioral intentions. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 11*, 57-67. doi: 10.2307/2488020

Snyder, J. L. (2012). Extending the empathic communication model of burnout: Incorporating individual differences to learn more about workplace emotion, communicative responsiveness, and burnout. *Communication Quarterly, 60*, 122-142. doi: 10.1080/01463373.2012.641837

Tashman, L. S., Tenenbaum, G., & Eklund, R. (2010). The effect of perceived stress on the relationship between perfectionism and coach burnout. *Anxiety, Stress & Coping, 23*, 195-212. doi**:**10.1080/10615800802629922

Terpstra, D. E., & Honoree, A. L. (2004). Job satisfaction and pay satisfaction levels of university faculty by discipline type and by geographic region. *Education, 124*, 528-539.

Tevan, J. J. (2007). Teacher temperament: Correlates with teacher caring, burnout, and organizational outcomes. *Communication Education, 56,* 382-400. doi: 10.1080/03634520701361912

Trombetta, J. J., & Rogers, D. P. (1988). Communication climate, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment: The effects of information adequacy, communication openness, and decision participation. *Management Communication Quarterly, 1,* 494-514. doi:10.1177/0893318988001004003

Vorell, M. S., Carmack, H. J., & Scarduzio, J. A. (in press). *The dark side of workplace communication: Recognizing and remedying the pitfalls of dysfunctional human interaction at work*. Kendall-Hunt Publishers.

Wheeless, L. R., Wheeless, V. E., Howard, R. D. (1984). The relationships of communication with supervisor and decision-participation to employee job satisfaction. *Communication Quarterly, 32*, 222-232. doi:10.1080/01463378409369555

Williams, C. A. (1989). Empathy and burnout in male and female helping professionals. *Research in Nursing & Health, 12,* 169-178. doi:10.1002/nur.4770120307 Witt,

L. A., & Nye, L. G. (1992). Gender and the relationship between perceived fairness of pay or promotion and job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 77*(6), 910-917. Retrieved from http://www.apa.org/pubs/journals/apl/

Wright, K. B., Banas, J. A., Bessarabova, E., & Bernard, D. R. (2010). A communication competence approach to examining health care social support, stress, and job burnout. *Health Communication, 25*, 375-382. doi: 10.1080/10410231003775206

Wu S., Zhu W., Wang Z., Wang M. & Lan Y. (2007) Relationship between burnout and occupational stress among nurses in China. *Journal of Advanced Nursing 59*(3), 233–239. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2648.2007.04301.x

Zhang, Q., & Zhu, W. (2007). Teacher stress, burnout, and social support in Chinese secondary education. *Human Communication, 10*, 487-496. Retrieved from http://www.uab.edu/Communicationstudies/humancommunication/

Zhang, Q., & Zhu, W. (2008). Exploring emotions in teaching: Emotional labor, burnout, and satisfaction in Chinese higher education. *Communication Education, 57*, 105-122. doi:10.1080/03634520701586310