DEBATE SCHOLARSHIP: A NEEDS ASSESSMENT

*Dale Herbeck**

Although there has been a great deal written about academic debate over the years, comparatively little has been written about debate research. Outside of a few bibliographies,[1] content summaries,[2] and calls for specific contributions,[3] no one has seriously addressed debate scholarship as a conceptual entity. Rather, the existing literature on debate scholarship has focused on either identifying or categorizing what has already been written. While such schemes are useful for recording what has been written about debate, they fail to assess the state of debate scholarship. Thus, there seems to be a need for some scholarship about debate scholarship.

As part of a larger collection of essays on forensic research, which is the theme of this special issue of the *National Forensic Journal*, this essay attempts to assess the state of debate research. It is not about a particular set of theoretical questions, but rather speaks to some broader issues underlying much of our writing about debate. Toward that end, this essay attempts to establish four different needs: first, the need for a new conception of debate pedagogy; second, the need for a philosophy of competitive debate that joins educational goals and practice; third, the need for reforging the connection between debate and argument; and fourth, the need for debate theory which improves debate practice. By establishing these needs, this essay implicitly critiques existing debate scholarship while simultaneously suggesting some possible areas of future inquiry.

**The National Forensic Journal*, VIII (Spring, 1990), 1-15.

DALE HERBECK is Assistant Professor and Director of Forensics in the Speech Communication & Theatre Department at Boston College. Portions of this essay were previously presented at the 1988 Eastern Communication Association Convention and the 1988 and 1989 Speech Communication Association Conventions. It would be a serious error not to recognize the influence of my colleague, John Katsulas, in the formulation of this essay.

[1]See, for example, Russell T. Church, "Bibliography of Argumentation and Debate for 1979," *Journal of the American Forensic Association* 17 (1981): 159-172; Russell T. Church and David C. Buckley, "Argumentation and Debating Propositions of Value," *Journal of the American Forensics Association* 19 (1983): 239-250; Walter Ulrich, *Debate Bibliography* (Kansas City: National Federation of State High School Associations, 1988).

[2]See, for example, David A. Thomas, "Research in Debate From the Past Five Years: Trends, Omissions, and Recommendations," in *Advanced Debate*, eds. David A. Thomas and Jack Hart (Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company, 1987), 15-28.

[3]See, for example, G. Thomas Goodnight, "The Re-Union of Argumentation and Debate Theory," in *Dimensions of Argumentation: Proceedings of the Second Summer Conference on Argumentation*, eds. George Ziegelmueller and Jack Rhodes (Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association, 1981), 415-432.

At the outset, it must be conceded that this is necessarily a subjective assessment. Those who conceive of debate differently may well find some of the claims and explanations developed objectionable, although all would surely recognize the importance of the topics being addressed. This essay is also grounded in my own experiences, largely in interscholastic and intercollegiate policy debate, and may therefore overreach when it speaks about "debate" as if it were a homogeneous entity. Bearing these qualifiers in mind, it is now possible to address some of the needs of debate research.

Debate Pedagogy

Expressed in the simplest of terms, debate pedagogy is scholarship about doing debate. If asked, most members of the forensic community would probably say that the primary problem with debate pedagogy to date is that it is in short supply.[4] This argument claims that we need more scholarship about doing debate, especially given the shortage of educators qualified to teach debate.[5] This deficiency could be redressed, the argument continues, if only we encouraged members of the debate community to write more about debate.

In fairness, there is a certain amount of truth in this line of thinking. Someone who entered the debate community without appreciable experience would find themselves in a strange new world inhabited by "turnarounds," "countervalues," "permutations," "holistic focus," and "topical counterplans." While these educators might be willing to take the time to learn the activity, there is a relative paucity of writing on teaching people how to debate. Although we have a wide variety of texts and guides, there is a need for even more introductory material designed specifically for those interested in joining our community. Indeed, much of what we label as "forensic pedagogy" presupposes a great deal of knowledge regarding contemporary procedures and practices.[6] These newcomers to the activity need more practical works which explain details ranging from case construction to refutation.

The real problem with this critique of forensics pedagogy, however, is that it is far too simplistic and charitable. It correctly diagnoses a quantitative deficiency, but it is unable to explain why debate coaches seem unwilling to write about debate. To my thinking, this is the more

[4]A new publication, *The Forensic Educator,* is a healthy development in this area. This publication is intended "to share insights, information, teaching strategies and ideas regarding high school forensics." "Preface," *The Forensic Educator* 1 (1986/1987): 2.

[5]See Adrian W. Frana, "Confronting the Coming Coaching Shortage," *Forensic Educator* 4 (1989/1990): 23-26.

[6]See, for example, the special issue of the *Journal of the American Forensic Association* containing "Essays on Forensics Pedagogy." *Journal of the American Forensic Association* 23 (1987): 183-235.

difficult and insightful question. Forensic educators do not write about debate for a reason. It is my contention that forensic pedagogy is deficient because many inside and outside of the forensic community believe that it is concerned with "performance" as opposed to "substance."[7] This is damning, because "performance" is traditionally perceived as being subservient to "substance" in importance and intellectual merit. As a result of this thinking, many competent forensic educators intentionally avoid writing about debate for fear that they will be ostracized from the communication discipline. When such forensic educators do write about debate, they carefully distinguish such work from their "scholarly" writing. All too many forensic educators count any writing about debate as service, while laboring to produce more traditional projects to satisfy publication requirements. Such attitudes are only reinforced by colleagues, review committees, and university administrators who often denigrate the importance of contributions to pedagogy.

This thinking directly threatens our activity in that it assumes that we must teach our students how to win debates *or* how to think critically and argue effectively. It suggests that there is a difference between formulating, researching, and assessing arguments and the actual practice of debating. If this thinking is accepted, our scholarship and intellectual efforts are destined to be regarded as an enterprise concerned with teaching technique at the expense of substance. We will become the sophists of our age, susceptible to the traditional indictments elucidated by Isocrates and others.[8]

If debate is to thrive and prosper in the years to come, we must challenge this stifling view of forensics pedagogy. Rather than distinguishing technique from substance, we must work to join them together in our writing, teaching, and coaching. We must define debate pedagogy as a union of "performance" and "substance." Our goal should be to produce students who are capable of thinking critically and arguing effectively. While he was speaking to the broader goals of the study of argumentation, Michael Calvin McGee explained this view as follows:

> I hope to see an argumentation practice that self-consciously aims to avoid an oligarchy of expertise which would condemn our students to the sad occupation of greasing organizational procedures.

---

[7]My argument here is based on insights developed more fully in Michael Calvin McGee, "The Moral Problem of Argumentum per Argumentum," in *Argument and Social Practice: Proceedings of the Fourth SCAIAFA Conference on Argumentation*, ed. by J. Robert Cox, Malcolm O. Sillars, and Gregg B. Walker (Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association, 1985), 1-15; and Bruce E. Gronbeck, "Rhetorical Criticism in the Liberal Arts Curriculum," *Communication Education* 38 (1989): 184-190.

[8]See, for example, Isocrates, *Isocrates 11*, trans, by George Norlin (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1962).

> I aspire to contribute to a theory of argumentation aimed at understanding the cultural materials which we must use to carve out the best possible life-world. Above all, I hope to live in a community where reality is lived, truths are made, and facts are used.[9]

If we adapt this view of argumentation to debate, it suggests that we must think of forensics pedagogy as more than exercises in the practical or advice on how to win more debates. Rather, debate pedagogy should be concerned with teaching people how to argue real issues, to find truths and make decisions.

This is not to suggest that we need to lessen or to conceal the competitive nature of our enterprise. There can be not doubt but that the competitive setting motivates much of what we do. However, we do ourselves a disservice when we allow debate pedagogy to become nothing more than advice for winning debates. We need to develop a sense of pedagogy which transcends competitive considerations. In its place, we need to develop and nurture a more sophisticated sense of our scholarship. We need to recognize and celebrate the importance of debate pedagogy and to produce pedagogy worthy of such acclaim.

A Philosophy of Competitive Debate that Joins Educational Goals and Practice

There has been a great deal written about the educational values of debating.[10] Unfortunately, little attempt has been made to relate these educational values to contemporary debate practice.[11] A growing body of evidence reveals that a disparity may be developing between our educational objectives and the forensic experience that we are providing to debaters.[12] Working from a survey of participants at the National Debate Tournament from 1947-1980, Ronald Matlon and Lucy Keele found that former NDT participants perceived there to be a decline in argument quality and an increase in esotericism. They report that "by decade, the following beliefs are clear: that the use of jargon is on the increase, that unrealistic and spurious arguments are on the increase,

[9]McGee 12.

[10]See, for example, Kent Colbert and Thompson Biggers, "Why Should We Support Debate?" *Journal ofthe American Forensic Association* 21 (1985): 237-240; and Dan Kahler, 'A Case for the Vocal Arts of Speech, Drama and Debate," *Forensic Educator* 1 (1986-1987): 5-7.

[11]For a notable exception see Kent R. Colbert, "The Effects of CEDA and NDT Debate Training on Critical Thinking Ability," *Journal of the American Forensic Association* 23 (1987): 194-201. As the title suggests, this study compares the effect of both NDT and CEDA debate training on a student's ability to reason effectively and thus directly assessing the relationship between existing practices an educational objectives.

[12]Any number of authors could be cited to substantiate this claim. See, for example, Michael McGough, "The Decline of Debate: Pull It Across Your Flow," *The New Republic* 10 Oct. 1988: 17-19; Karen McGlashen, "On the State of Debate," *California Speech Bulletin* 23 (1990): 26-28.

that lack of synthesis of thought is more noticeable, that quantity over quality is apparent, and that too much reliance on evidence at the expense of developed arguments surfaces more in the last decade."[13] Commenting in "On Collegiate Debating," former debater Craig Pinkus charges that contemporary debate is "an exercise which would vide good training for only two occupations: becoming an auctioneer and making Federal Express commercials. And that's all."[14] Such evidence is disconcerting, for it suggests that we have lost sight of the goals of our activity.

At the same time that there has been a change in the nature of competitive debate, there has also been a change in the way that forensic educators view debate. In earlier days, debate was seen as an extension of the classroom. Debate as a co-curricular activity existed for the primary purpose of teaching students how to argue effectively. Educators imposed a preconceived set of standards of what constituted sound argumentation. Debaters who deviated from these norms would receive expert feedback from critics recommending ways of making their cases and negative positions conform to sound argumentative principles. If during a debate one side initiated blatantly unsound arguments or theory positions, it was the responsibility of the judge as an educator to vote against that team, regardless of whether their opposition was technically proficient enough to beat them on the flow sheet. It was in that pedagogical spirit that A.C. Baird advocated penalizing debaters who insisted "that 'should' implies merely theoretical desirability but carries no requirement of practicability" and/or who used "peculiar" analysis "seemingly devised to throw the other team off guard."[15] Educators believed it was more important to discourage unsound and uneducational practices than to reward the performance of technically proficient debaters. The fear existed that if critics started voting for technique over substance, debate arguments would, in the words of Ehninger, "tend to become ever more esoteric, elaborate, and far-fetched."[16]

A profound change in attitude is evident today. Instead of regarding themselves as forensic professionals or educators, many critics see themselves as referees more concerned with enforcing competitive

[13]Ronald J. Matlon and Lucy M. Keele, "A Survey of Participants in the National Debate Tournament, 1947-1980," *Journal of the American Forensic Association* 20 (1984): 203-204.

[14]Craig Pinkus, "On Collegiate Debating," *Spectra* 19 (1983): 6. See also Norman Snow, "Letter to the Editor," *American Forensic Association Newsletter* 9 (1987): 11-13.

[15]A. Craig Baird, *Argumentation, Discussion and Debate* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1950) 363.

[16]Douglas Ehninger, "The Debater about Debating," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 44 (1958): 133.

fairness than with promoting educational standards. According to Rowland and Deatherage, "judges have focused on fairly resolving debates, while largely ignoring the educational effects of some of the practices that refusing to intervene was encouraging."[17] Judges now view their role as that of a neutral critic charged with processing information and producing an impartial decision. Indeed, the common debate ballot no longer asks who did "the better debating." Rather, the ballot now asks simply "who won the debate."[18]

This attitude toward judging debate has come to be known as *tabula rasa.* This phrase reflects the idea that the good critics should approach each debate without preconceptions. While some claim this constitutes a paradigm, it seems more properly characterized as an attitude toward judging in that it transcends the traditional paradigms. Most policymakers, hypothesis testers, or advocates, for example, also claim to be *tabula rasa* judges. The spread of this mentality has been justified on two accounts: promoting diversity of thought and ensuring competitive fairness through judge objectivity. Walter Ulrich, the leading proponent of *tabula rasa* judging, explains:

> *Tabula rasa* is consistent with an important goal of debate-encouraging intellectual experimentation—since it permits all issues to be open to discussion. New theories can be introduced and old ones modified. This invites debaters to understand the reasons behind theoretical positions. Instead of arguing that inherency is a voting issue, speakers are required to understand why inherency is important and what functions inherency performs. The *tabula rasa* approach also creates a sense of fairness, since both teams know that the judge will be open to all of their arguments.[19]

Subscribing to this reasoning, most judges have adopted a *tabula rasa* philosophy and as a result have ceased imposing educational standards on debate.[20] Worse yet, according to Ganer, "we have carried the

---

[17]Robert C. Rowland and Scott Deatherage, "The Crisis in Policy Debate," *Journal of the American Forensic Association* 24 (1988): 248.

[18]The importance of this subtle, yet highly significant, change is developed more fully by B. Christine Shea and T. C. Winebrenner, 'Abusing the Debate Situation," paper presented at the Speech Communication Association Convention, San Francisco, Nov. 1989.

[19]Walter Ulrich, Judging Academic Debate (Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook, 1987) 38.

[20]See Austin J. Freeley, Judging Paradigms: The impact of the Critic on Argument," in *Dimensions of Argument,* 433-447; Ronald J. Matlon and John D. Cross, "An Analysis of Judging Philosophies in Academic Debate," *Journal of the American Forensic Association* 15 (1978): 110-123; and Robert C. Rowland, "*Tabula Rasa:* The Relevance of Debate to Argumentation Theory," *Journal of the American Forensic Association* 21 (1984): 76-88.

notion of a blank slate to an extreme that is unwarranted in any type of real-world application."[21]

Knowing that judges would passively sit back and approach all arguments in a credulous fashion, debaters have responded by advocating increasingly preposterous arguments and abusive theoretical claims.[22] Experienced debaters quickly learned that they could overwhelm most of their opponents by employing speed, unusual theory, or esoteric arguments. By rewarding debaters who utilize such tactics, judges have encouraged other debaters to copy them until they eventually have come to be viewed as legitimate strategies in the forensic community. Such judge passivity is responsible today for the decline in the quality of debate arguments and the promotion of esoteric theory having little educational utility.[23]

As forensic educators we need to reflect on the appropriate philosophy for judging debate. Specifically, we need scholarship which looks at the connections between judging criteria, contemporary debate practice, and the desired educational objectives. We desperately need a philosophy of debate which can interface these goals with debate practices. Several scholars have already addressed this task, although their work is only a beginning. Douglas,[24] for example, has suggested that if we conceive of debate in terms of an inquiry method for examining and testing ideas of contemporary societal problems instead of as a pedagogical method for training skills of speaking, we may still yet establish a living bond between forensic and contemporary educational demands. Along the same lines, a recent essay by Miller[25] has suggested that the imposition of more ideological judging standards would "move debate back on an educational path."

---

[21]Patricia M. Ganer, "The Emperor Phenomenon: The Necessity of Critic Responsibility," in *Argument and Critical Practice: Proceedings of the Fifth SCA/AFA Conference on Argumentation*, ed. by Joseph W. Wenzel (Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association, 1987): 389.

[22]See Jack H. Howe, "CEDA's Objectives: Lest We Forget," *CEDA Yearbook 2* (1981): 1-3.

[23]A number of critics of the *tabula rasa* perspective predicted this would happen. See, for example, Craig W. Cutbirth, "Is Debate Becoming the New 'Sport of Kings'?" *Debate Issues*, (1986): 13- 15; Richard Dempsey, "The Myth of the *Tabula Rasa Judge,"* paper presented at the Central States Speech Association Convention, Lincoln, NE, (1983); Richard H. Dempsey and D.J. Hartmann, "Emergent Voting Criteria and Judicial Impotence of Critics," *Journal of the American Forensic Association* 22 (1986): 167-175; and Ralph E. Dowling, "Debate as Game, Educational Tool, and Argument: An Evaluation of Theory and Rules," *Journal of the American Forensic Association* 17 (1981): 234-241.

[24]Donald G. Douglas, "Toward a Philosophy of Forensic Education," *Journal of the American Forensic Association* 8 (1971): 41.

[25]Greg R. Miller, "The Forensics Critic as an 'Ideologue-Critic': An Argument for Ideology as a New Paradigm for Academic Debate," *CEDA Yearbook* 9 (1988): 76.

Balancing these competing and often conflicting considerations will be difficult, according to Zarefsky, as "an educational approach leads inherently to the tension between providing structured environment—formats, rules, standards, guidelines, and the like—to maximize the chance of positive results, and providing freedom and guidance to students as they learn to make difficult choices for themselves.[26] These difficulties notwithstanding, such an effort is vital if we are to achieve the lofty goals we have set for our activity and to secure our place among the liberal arts.

Reforging the Connection Between Argumentation and Debate

In addition to reconsidering our views about debate we need to rethink the relationship between debate and argument theory. It has become fashionable of late to claim that debate is a laboratory for practicing argumentation. The "Definitional Statement" of the National Developmental Conference on Forensics clearly expresses that desire, suggesting that debates "are laboratories for helping students to understand and communication various forms more effectively in a variety of contexts with a variety of audiences."[27] Any number of forensic educators have concurred in this judgement.[28] Unfortunately, few findings of any sort have come from this laboratory. Despite years of competition and literally tens of thousands of rounds of competition, we have produced few insights into argumentation theory. There are, of course, several notable exceptions to this generalization. Wallace, for example used the stock issues in debate to establish a topoi of values.[29] Rowland used the *tabula rasa* paradigm of debate to illustrate some of the problems implicit in a dialectical approach to argument.[30] Nonetheless, these examples stand virtually alone. Fritch has lamented that few scholars "have attempted to use the debate forum as an arena of research data."[31] Indeed, Goodnight has gone so far as to note that "a

---

[26]Zarefsky, "In Search of the Forensics Community," *California Speech Bulletin* 23 (1990): 32. The essay is Zarefsky's Keynote Address to the National Conference on Forensics Education, Evanston, IL, 1989.

[27]Definitional Statement," in *Forensics as Communication: The Argumentative Perspective*, ed. by James H. McBath (Skokie: National Textbook, 1975) 11.

[28]See, for example, Zarefsky, 31; Ganer, 387; and Thomas Hollihan and Patricia Riley, 'Academic Debate and Democracy: A Clash of Ideologies," in *Argument and Critical Practice* 399.

[29]Karl R. Wallace, "The Substance of Rhetoric: Good Reasons," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 49 (1963): 240-249.

[30]Robert C. Rowland, "Tabula Rasa: The Relevance of Debate to Argumentation Theory," *Journal of the American Forensic Association* 21 (1984): 76-88.

[31] John E. Fritch, "The Relationship Between Debate Theory, Practice and Pedagogy," paper presented at the 1989 Central States Speech Convention, Kansas City, MO, Apr. 1989.

significant gap seems to be developing between theories of argument and theories of debate."[32] Debate has, quite literally, become an end unto itself. If we use the laboratory metaphor, we are forced to conclude that debate exists as a laboratory solely for perfecting debate.

The divergency of debate from argumentation is problematic. First, to the extent that we allow debate to become an end unto itself we forfeit an ideal opportunity to study argumentation. Goodnight suggests the following possibilities: using debate to study the nature of argument fields, analyzing debates to assess changes in social structure, assessing the political implications of policy choices, studying how values are defined and linked, and using debate to test the continued acceptability and worth of social knowledge.[33] Fritch, also recognizing the potential of debate to serve as a laboratory, claims that debate could be used to re-evaluate traditional concepts within a relatively pure setting, to study the relationship between the purpose and the practice of argument, and to study the standards for assessing arguments and the decision making process.[34]

Second, when we recognize debate as an end unto itself we legitimate a host of practices and procedures which may be antithetical to acceptable principles of argumentation.[35] While any number of examples might be used to illustrate this point, I wish to focus primarily on the construction of arguments and the use of evidence in debate. It is my belief that contemporary debate teaches an erroneous conception of argumentation in that it emphasizes conclusions at the expense of claims. This can be demonstrated by considering the types of arguments made and by looking at the use of evidence by debaters to justify those arguments. Rather than explaining the reasons used to justify a particular conclusion, many debates have become little more than exercises in offering judgments. The content of such debates is limited to the presentation of a list of claims complete with an expert opinion providing authoritative support for each of the conclusions. All too often, there is very little explanation for the connection between the evidence and the claims that the evidence is offered to support. The evidence substantiates the claim, but it provides no warrant or explanation for why the claim is correct. As a result, the reason justifying the conclusion is lost. McGough, commenting on high school debate in *The New Republic*, noted that "in the surreal world of abstraction that is debate, one argu-

---

[32]Goodnight 415.

[33]Goodnight 426-428.

[34]See Fritch 11-13.

[35]This position is developed more fully in Karla K. Leeper and Dale A. Herbeck, "Policy Debate and Argumentation Skills: An Unsuitable Forum?" paper presented at annual meeting of the Central States Speech Association, Kansas City, MO, Apr. 1989.

ment is as good as another—provided that it is supported by a 'quote card' from an expert. Conversely, an assertion, however self-evident, that cannot be so corroborated is suspect."[36] Worse yet, debaters are equally prone to assume that evidence should be compared based on its quantity as opposed to its quality. Thus, they will shout that they are "outcarding" the opposition by a margin of two or three to one. The clear assumption is the side with more cards on the argument should win the point. Unfortunately, neither of these practices reveal any understanding of how claims are justified or how critics differentiate between arguments.

While debaters frequently ignore explanations, they are equally likely to ignore the qualifications of the authors or publications being cited in a debate. Sources are seldom introduced with the evidence, infrequently discussed during a debate, and all too often the qualifications of the sources are not available at the end of the debate. In many debates the citation is reduced to a name and a date. Even when courses are known and provided, debaters seem unable or unwilling to critically evaluate evidence. As a result, all sources are given equal weight, regardless of their expertise or ideological bias. I routinely hear debaters quote freely from *The Plain Truth*, Lyndon LaRouche, and *The Socialist Worker*. The rigorous work of respected scientists is often treated with the same respect as a phrase or sentence fragment from a local newspaper or a flyer passed out in an airport. Such evidentiary practices are alarming, for they suggest little understanding of how claims are justified.

Worse yet, advocates are rarely willing to admit reservations or to place qualifiers upon their arguments. Debates are won and lost upon the proof of an absolute voting issue against the opposition. The need for absolute certainty, or at least the proof of a substantial risk is necessary to win many judges' ballots. As a consequence, arguments which may exist only in a qualified form in the real world take on iron-clad certainty within the debate context. Thus, it is not surprising to hear that virtually any action will substantially increase the risk of an economic cataclysm, an environmental nightmare or a military confrontation. This result in the distortion of many legitimate intellectual positions.

Finally, contemporary debaters have little conception of audience. Admittedly, they understand which judges appreciate rapid delivery, who demands full source qualifications, and who doesn't vote on topicality, but they show no appreciation of which arguments a judge finds intellectually preferable. Debaters rightly understand that most judges

[36]McGough 19.

are information processors. This phenomenon has resulted in garbled debates which bear little resemblance to real decision making situations. We are supposed to be persuaded by one or two quotations and a sentence of explanation that nuclear war is good, anarchy is a workable form of government, and a host of other unusual, inconsistent and, perhaps to some, inconceivable positions. While a skilled researcher can probably find evidence to support virtually any claim, we do debaters a disservice when we imply that anyone can be convinced of anything as it often seems in the debate context.

Taken together, these deficiencies are disconcerting because they suggest that debate may not be an appropriate method for teaching argumentation. Debate is rewarding practices which have very little application beyond the competitive setting. It is difficult to imagine situations in which advocates present evidence but not reasons, in which advocates intentionally overclaim positions, and in which advocates ignore the preoccupations or biases of the audience. When arguing outside of a competitive debate, none of these practices would likely prove persuasive. As Rowland and Deatherage aptly point out, in a policy making setting unsubstantiated argumentation is often ignored or rejected.[37] Moreover, advocates are careful to qualify their arguments. While we can think of obvious examples of hyperbole, responsible advocates do not knowingly misrepresent positions. Finally, advocates dealing with real audiences know that they are not information processors.

If debate is a laboratory for developing argumentation theory and perfecting argumentation skills, it is apparent that something is seriously amiss. Ganer has lamented that "if we defend competitive debate on the grounds that it teaches students to think, and if that has to be done all over once they are out of the activity, we have lost our *raison d'etre.*"[36] To redress this deficiency we need to find the lost connection between argumentation and debate. We need to attempt and draw some conclusions about argumentation theory from the extended and ongoing experiment in debate. At the same time, we need to reaffirm that debate is a laboratory for perfecting argumentation by encouraging practices designed to improve the quality of the argument being produced. Toward that end, we need scholarship which suggest how we can integrate argumentation theory into debate practice. Such scholarship would be of value to students of argumentation and at the same time might provide an impetus for addressing some of the weak argumentative practices in debate.

---

[37]Rowland and Deatherage 248.

[38]See Rowland and Deatherage 248.

Debate Theory Which Improves Debate Practice

I have intentionally placed debate theory last on my list of needs because I believe that it is the area which requires the least amount of additional research. This lesser need, however, probably flows from the fact that we have done a much better job of developing debate theory. Not surprisingly, as debate theory has grown in complexity it has become a larger issue within debates. Michael Weiler has observed that "theoretical arguments have composed an even larger portion of competitive debates."[39] Roger Solt has lamented that overemphasis on theoretical issues "express(es) the recent tendency of debate to become increasingly esoteric, overly wrapped up in itself, and divorced from real policy concerns."[40]

While some have defended the development of debate theory and argued that it should be encouraged in debate rounds,[41] the further development of debate theory is problematic for three reasons. First, most theory does not contribute substantively to our understanding of debate. Zarefsky has observed that "not entirely without foundation is the oft-repeated charge that research of this type is trivial, even banal—and the reason is that is does not advance our understanding of forensics, the genus."[42] Instead it increases our understanding of how a particular construct might be applied to gain a strategic advantage in a debate.

Second, it often seems to the informed observer that debate theory has become an end unto itself. Such theory has become so specialized that it has made debate almost indecipherable to the uninformed observer. Hollihan, Baaske, and Riley rightly note that:

> academic debate has become an activity that those of us actively involved in it value, but which cannot be celebrated in the presence of our faculty colleagues, university administrators, community leaders, or even alumni if they graduated more than ten years ago.[43]

---

[39]Michael Weiler, "Debate Theory: Delusion and Snare," paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Anaheim, CA, Nov. 1981.

[40]Roger Solt, "Critique of the Final Round of the 1980 National Debate Tournament," *Journal of the American Forensic Association* 17 (1980): 56.

[41]See, for example, Robert H. Gass, Jr., "Theoretical Arguments in Debate Rounds: Toward a Justification," *Journal of the American Forensic Association* 23 (1987): 220-235.

[42]David Zarefsky, "Argumentation and Forensics," in *Proceedings of the Summer Conference on Argumentation*, ed. Jack Rhodes and Sara Newell (Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association, 1980) 22.

[43]Thomas A. Hollihan, Kevin T Baaske, Patricia Riley, "Debaters as Storytellers: The Narrative Perspective in Academic Debate," *Journal of the American Forensic Association* 23 (1987): 185.

Moreover, the increased focus on debate theory detracts from the meaningful discussion of policy alternatives. The National Developmental Conference on Forensics recognizes these unique educational skills promoted by policy debate:

> Conferees recognized that the traditional practice of debating propositions of public policy has many educational purposes, and they particularly endorsed its value as a means of preparing people to participate as advocates or critics in situations in which policy decisions must be made. The theory and practice of debating propositions of public policy in interscholastic competition, therefore, should be based upon sound theory and practice appropriate for realistic policy deliberations.[44]

While it would be unfair to link all of our woes to debate theory, there is no doubt but that some portion of this problem, either directly or indirectly, has been caused by the development of debate theory.

Finally, the growing sophistication of debate theory has created formidable barriers to participation in the activity. This becomes increasingly evident when one remembers that at one time, a considerably more heterogeneous mix of persons were involved in intercollegiate debate. Participants included students with and without high school debate experience; coaches who were formerly college debaters, coaches who were formerly high school debate coaches, and coaches who were speech and argument teachers who began debate programs form scratch. Today, the activity has become so specialized that only a very small group of students and coaches are able to compete in policy debate. While CEDA debate theory is less specialized, it now appears that theory has become more prevalent in that type of debate as well. All too often, extensive theoretical knowledge is required as a precondition of participation.

This is not to say that debate theory is evil, nor is it to argue that we should go back to the debate of an earlier era. I am not arguing for a return to "the good old days." Rather my contention, like that of Rowland, is that debate theory should be assessed primarily on its implications for debate.[45] While this appears easy enough, it would have a profound impact on debate theory. Robert Gass, for example, has suggested that debate theory should be evaluated according to some combination of the following seven standards: self-consistency, falsif iability or testability, simplicity, generality, predictability, repeatability, and

---

[44]James H. McBath, ed. "Recommendations adopted by the National Developmental Conference on Forensics," in *Forensics as Communication* (Skokie: National Textbook, 1975) 20.

[45]See Robert Rowland, "The Relationship Between Realism and Debatability in Policy Advocacy," *Journal of the American Forensic Association* 22 (1986): 125-134.

visualizability.[46] While these are all valid tests of a theory, they do nothing to assess the effect of a theory on the quality of debate. Theory should be evaluated based on how it interacts with debate. "Good" theory should promote argumentative clash and reasoned discussion of the pertinent issues.

Working from this conception of theory, any number of theoretical issues worthy of scholarship could be pursued. Commenting on value debate, Matlon has suggested that we still lack "commonly accepted ground regarding the model of ideal value debate."[47] This difficulty, Matlon continues, is heightened by the "quasi-policy" nature of value topics selected in recent years.[48] To redress these problems it will be necessary to consider anew the nature of value resolutions, how values are justified, and how judges should assess competing value debates. While some of the necessary theoretical tools could be borrowed from policy debate, there are substantive differences in the two forms of debate resolutions which may prevent the importation of vital concepts such as presumption and inherency. Moreover, if value debate is to emerge as a distinct entity, it will be necessary to avoid borrowing concepts as this practice would make value debate dependent on the resolution of theoretical controversies in policy debate.[49]

Within policy debate there is probably less need for sweeping theoretical innovation. Recent years have seen fewer major ideas, although the introduction of the "narrative paradigm"[50] may have significant implications for contemporary practice. However, we need to reconsider many of the existing theoretical constructs based on how they "fit" within the existing debate format. For example, we need to adapt existing paradigms to the debate format, to develop a workable model of fiat, to define the ground available to the negative for formulating counterplans, to reconcile the different ways of viewing the resolution, and to consider how contemporary tactics affect the quality of argument. While this list could surely be extended, in many respects the research required is reactive in that it will assess previously developed constructs rather than breaking new ground.

There is undoubtly a need for more debate theory, especially with respect to value debate. The point of the huge caveat in this essay is to urge caution—debate theory often affects debate practice in strange

---

[46]Gass 228-223.

[47]Ronald Matlon, "Debating Propositions of Value: An Idea Revisited," *CEDA Yearbook* 9 (1988): 4.

[48]Matlon 6.

[49]My discussion of borrowing is grounded in Charles A. Willard, 'Argument Fields," in *Advances in Argumentation Theory and Research*, ed. by J. Robert Cox and Charles A. Willard (Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1982) 24-77. Hollihan, et al. 184-193.

and detrimental ways. Debate theory should not, under any circumstance, be used to legitimize practices that run counter to educational considerations or sound argumentative practices. We should also be wary of theoretical innovations which further increase the specialization of debate.

Although I have adopted a critical tone throughout this essay, I want to end on a positive note. I believe that debate is a vibrant and vital activity. Our teaching and coaching experiences, a variety of studies, and personal testimonials all attest to the value of debate. Unfortunately, it is easy to lose sight of what is right with debate and to dwell on our failures. As a community, we have grown increasingly introspective. It often seems that everyone has their own theory about why debate is disintegrating or regressing. While such introspection frequently produces constructive reform, it often functions to divide our community into warring factions. Rather than concentrating on what is right with forensics, we spend our time trying to identify villains and assign blame. This is not to say that debate is immune from criticism; rather it is to suggest that a more constructive approach would be to try to improve our activity through our scholarship. In this positive spirit I have tried to establish some needs which might lead researchers in that direction.

INDIVIDUAL EVENTS RESEARCH: A REVIEW AND CRITICISM

*Brenda J. Logue and B. Christine Shea**

> 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 as weak as its research and scholarship.
>
> James McBath, 1975

Periodically, it is a wise idea to examine what a field has been producing in terms of its research and scholarship. Forensic scholars have on occasion undertaken extensive reviews of research and theorizing in forensics (Andersen, 1966; Logue & Shea, 1989; McBath, Bartanen, & Gossett, 1977; McGlone, 1969; Thomas, 1979 & 1983; Walwick, 1969). For the most part these reviews have emphasized debate writings, since scholarship in individual events was relatively scarce until the 1980s. Thomas (1983) concluded in his section on individual events, that "the published research in individual events shows considerable progress in both quality and amount in the past five years" (p. 16). Besides the continuance of individual events articles in the *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, Thomas noted two other occurrences contributing to the increased quality and quantity of individual events research: (1) the emergence of the *National Forensic Journal* with its premier issue in 1983 under the editorship of Michael Kelley and (2) the appearance of individual events papers at the Second and Third Summer Conference on Argumentation, Alta, Utah, in 1981 and 1983, respectively.

Following Thomas' work, Logue and Shea (1989) critiqued forensic research in general from 1984-1988. They reviewed six forensic publications: *JAFA, The National Forensic Association Journal,* the *CEDA Yearbook, The Forensic, Speaker and Gavel,* and the Proceedings of the Summer Argumentation Conferences.

This article will focus upon and expand the criticism of individual events research summarized by Logue and Shea (1989), and suggest a research agenda for the 1990s.

Methodology

Just as criticism is an important part of the modern scientist's activity (Knutson, 1979), criticism of individual events scholarship should

**The National Forensic Journal* VIII, (Spring, 1990), pp. 17-27.

BRENDA J. LOGUE is Associate Professor, Director of Forensics in the Department of Speech and Mass Communication, Towson, Maryland, 21204. B. CHRISTINE SHEA, is Lecturer and Assistant Director of Forensics, Department of Speech Communication, California St. Poly University, San Luis Obispo, CA, 93407.

serve similar functions: "to appraise the quality and value of our knowledge claims, the accuracy of the procedures and methods employed to arrive at those claims, as well as the underlying merit of the endeavor itself" (Knutson, p. 2). Logue (1988) argued that a critical review of forensics scholarship should be founded upon valid criteria. She described three criteria for research criticism: examination of the core issues of the discipline, generalizability of the research, and internal validity or methodological concerns.

Thomas (1979, 1983) supports the notion of grounding research in the core issues of a discipline. Logue and Shea (1989) argued these core issues should be found in the definitional base of the field, as described by the two forensic developmental conferences.

1. Forensics should function as an educational laboratory.
2. The aim of the laboratory should be the improvement of student abilities in areas such as research, analysis, and oral communication.
3. The cornerstone of the forensic laboratory should be the argumentative perspective.

Each of the core issues was further operationalized by the following definitions: (1) The educational laboratory would be concerned with pedagogical matters such as "how to" coach particular events or skills, "how to" judge events in the community, or "how to" structure tournaments or specific events. (2) The core concept of improving abilities in research, analysis and oral communication was conceptualized as dealing with benefits or forensic participation, measurement of skill improvement, or criticism of skill development. (3) The argumentative perspective on communication, as McBath (1984) described, "involves the study of reason given by people as justification for acts, beliefs, attitudes, and values" (p.5).[1]

Generalizibility, the second criterion, is the social utility or application of research beyond the subjects studied or described. Tucker, Weaver, and Berryman-Fink (1981) wrote that:

> the goal of research is to provide sets of findings that can contribute to theories and that provide a basis for generalization beyond the confines of the study itself. A study whose findings relate only to the specific persons, entities, or elements contained in that study is of minimal value. Some degree of generalization is the goal. (p. 233)

Logue & Shea (1989) categorized each individual events article as to its generalizability or social utility. They questioned whether the article applied to the entire forensic community, to individual events in general, or to a specific individual event. Social utility of the research beyond

[1]These core concepts are not without controversy (see Thomas, 1983) on the argumentative perspective.

forensics was also identified. Did the scholarship make contributions to argumentation theory, to communication theory, etc?

The third and final criterion for evaluation was that of internal validity or methodology—what is the method of scholarship, is it appropriate, and is there sufficiency of data analysis? Whereas this criterion appears to be most relevant to quantitative studies, methodological processes can be either quantitative or qualitative in nature. For this evaluation, each article was categorized *qualitative, quantitative,* or *informative.* Those labeled as *qualitative* were primarily constructed in an argumentative manner, whereby the author(s) argued a particular position. The *quantitative* articles were concerned with survey data or number gathering in the broadest sense. *Informative* articles merely described a situation or program, without arguing a position.

To achieve our goal of assessing individual events research, the data for this examination is limited to works published in the *NFA Journal.* Such a move is valid, for the previously mentioned Logue/Shea study found that the vast majority of individual events articles were published in theMvl *Journal,* thus the assumption that the seven years of that journal would be representative of individual events research. In this paper we will apply the three criteria developed above—core issues, generalizability, and methodology. Finally, suggestions are made for a research agenda into the 1990s.

Results

Over the seven year existence of the *NFA Journal,* close to 100 articles have been published. Sixty-five of the articles were longer research papers and twenty-eight were shorter, opinion commentaries which we refer to as "forum" pieces (See Table 1).

Table 1
Number of Articles by Year

Type of Articles	83	84	85	86	87	88	89	Totals
a. articles	7	7	12	10	10	11	8	**65**
b. forum piece	4	7	5	4	1	3	4	**28**

The significant number of articles in the *NFA Journal* focus upon the core issue of forensics as an educational laboratory (See Table 2). Only three articles dealt with skill improvement or skill acquisition: In 1983, Greenstreet recommended PBS and NPR as research sources for topics; in 1988, Colbert described the speaking rates found in CEDA final rounds; and in 1989 Wood and Rowland-Morin looked at skills acquisition as motivational reasons for students debating. Thus, two of the three skills articles were about debate exclusively, and not individu-

al events. Articles which upheld the argumentative perspective occurred relatively infrequently in *NFA Journal's* seven-year history. Verlinden (1987) discussed the argumentative perspective in oral interpretation. In that same year, Gloria Boone wrote about coaching impromptu; a subplot to that article concerned the creation of arguments in impromptu.

Table 2

Core Issues by Year

Core Issue	**83**	**84**	**85**	**86**	**87**	**88**	**89**	**Totals**
a. Ed laboratory	9	12	17	12	10	10	8	78
b. Skills	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	3
c. Arg Persp	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2
d. Other[2]	1	2	0	2	0	2	3	10

With regard to the second evaluative criterion, the method used in presenting the material, more than 50 percent of the articles were descriptive or informational in nature and did not utilize any quantification (See Table 3). Approximately one-quarter of the articles were developed using numerical quantification, but even these works incorporated few statistical procedures. For instance, this research typically involved percentages or frequency counts such as in Clobert's (1988) counting of words per minute across speaker positions through three years of CEDA finals. No statistical significance comparisons were made of the rate increases. There are exceptions however. In a 1989 article, Gotcher and Honeycutt used a discriminant analysis to identify differences between debate and individual events.

The final one-quarter of the articles attempted to construe positions by developing arguments. For example, John Murphy's (1988) commentary on communication analysis argues for more emphasis on textual analysis rather than on methodology. In that same issue, Aden and Kay argue for an argumentative phrasing of extemporaneous topics.

Table 3
Research Method by Year

Method	**83**	**84**	**85**	**86**	**87**	**88**	**89**	**Totals**
a Oualitative Argumentative	2	2	5	5	1	5	3	23
b Ouantitative	2	2	4	4	3	4	4	23
c Descriptive Informational	7	10	8	5	7	5	5	47

[2]The articles that dealt with specific organizational matters (e.g., the history of the NFA) were categorized outside the three designated core issues.

The final criterion used in this criticism is that of generalizibility or social utility (See Table 4). Approximately 70 percent of the *NFA Journal* articles are useful for individual events in general or specifically.

Table 4

Generalizability by Year

Social Utility	83	84	85	86	87	88	89	Totals
a. debate	2	1	1	3	0	2	1	10
b. general ie	6	2	1	4	1	1	3	18
c. specific ie	3	7	13	6	6	9	3	47
d. general forensics	0	2	2	1	2	0	1	8
e. comm theory	0	0	4*	0	0	0	0	4*
f. organization administrative	0	2	0	0	2	2	4	10

*Rhetorical criticism articles could be useful to the communication field in general, initially categorized under specific ie.

Approximately 9 percent of these articles are about debate and thus are generalizable only to that form of forensics. Even fewer articles (8.6%) are useful to forensics in general, both debate and individual events. The remaining space in this journal (9.6%) is devoted to administrative or organizational articles (e.g., history of NFA, fundraising, National Development Conference thoughts). Only in 1985 did the issue on rhetorical criticism produce works that had potential utility to the field of communication in general.

More than half of the articles are applicable to the specific event discussed (See Table 5). In examining these specific subject areas for the journal, the number of selections were evenly divided between the areas of judging/critiquing and coaching of events. The events most often discussed in the writings were oral interpretation and rhetorical criticism. The emphasis in the interpretation articles appeared to deal with judging; while the primary issue of rhetorical criticism scholarship concerned speech construction (e.g., analysis and methodology). The event of persuasion or oratory placed a distant third in frequency of articles generated.

Table 5

Subject Areas by Year

Subject Area	83	84	85	86	87	88	89
a. Evaluating							
Judging events	1	2	0	0	1	0	0
-ADS	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
-RC	0	1	0	0	1	0	0
-Imp/Extemp	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
-persuasion	2	0	0	0	0	1	0
b. Coaching events							
-persuasion	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
-impromptu	0	0	0	0	2	0	0
-ads	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
-extemp	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
-RC	0	0	6	0	0	1	1
-interp	0	0	2	1	1	3	1
-duo	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
-research	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
c. Tournament							
-administration	1	1	0	1	0	1	1
-formats/events	0	4	0	2	0	1	1
-dress	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
-re questioning	0	0	5	0	0	0	1
d. Forensic activity							
-funding	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
-evaluating st	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
-employment	0	0	0	1	0	0	3
-research	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
-recruitment	0	0	2	0	0	0	0
-curricular	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
f. Organizational							
-history	0	1	0	0	2	0	0
-NDCF	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
g. Debate	1	0	0	0	0	2	1
-ethics	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
-cross-exam	0	0	1	3	0	0	0
h. Students	0	0	1	0	0	0	2
i. Ethics	3	0	0	0	0	0	0

Discussion

The average number of articles published per year over the last seven years by the *NFA Journal* (11.3 per year) equates with the numbers that Logue and Shea (1989) reported for both *JAFA* (11.4 per year) and the *CEDA Yearbook* (11 per year). In their five-year critique of forensic research in general, Logue and Shea found that between 1984-88, the *NFA Journal* had a slightly higher publication rate (average of 14 articles per year). The addition of 1983 and 1989 to this five-year review brings the *NFA Journal* in line with the other two journals noted.

The core issue of the educational laboratory dominated the *NFA Journal* as well as *The Forensic* and *The Speaker and the Gavel* (Logue and

Shea, 1989). For *JAFA* and *The CEDA Yearbook*, the argumentative perspective core issue shared equal space with the educational laboratory. Even so, this body of "educational laboratory" literature typically discusses only strategies for tournament practices. In other words, while the forensic field may define itself as "an educational laboratory" the writings ultimately depict it as a field of "tournament activities and competitive strategies."

Ballinger and Brand (1987) raised this concern in their analysis of persuasive speaking. They complained that the laboratory which implied experimentation and refinement of ideas was actually stifling and reinforcing only one type of organizational pattern. The exclusive concept of tournaments as laboratory inhibits truly experimental events such as festivals, workshops, and student forensic conferences. These latter forms are not explored in any individual events research.

Closely associated with the idea of forensics as an "educational laboratory" is the core issue of "skill improvement." This concept, however is rarely addressed in individual events research. This was also a "problematic area" for the other forensic journals investigated by Logue & Shea (1989). They write that "it is as though the forensic field assumes skill improvement. Intuitively and antecdotely this may be the case, but for a discipline entrenched in documentation and analysis, the evidence on skill development is sorely lacking" (p. 453). If a field is defined by what is written in its journals, then perhaps the core issue of skill development, as promulgated by the Developmental Conferences, is not viewed as a central concern.

This lack of skill research may be indicative of recent trends in the broader discipline of speech communication. Lee and Lee (1987) described skill and technique training as low-level matters of academic concern. They note that the communication field is shifting its emphasis to understanding process rather than mastering skills and thus admonish that "if forensic educators continue to retain their outdated role as academic Dale Carnegies, then serious problems of scholarly legitimacy will persist" (p. 356).

The core issue of the argumentative perspective predominates debate research (Logue & Shea, 1989). Relatively few individual events articles develop this concept, with the exceptions of: Aden and Kay's (1988) article on wording extemporaneous topics to enhance argumentative development; Boone's advocacy of the use of metaphorical topoi in impromptu training; Verlinden's (1987) argument for an interpreter "to present critical claims about the literature and use the performance to support those claims" (p. 66); and Murphy's (1989) claim as to the unequal treatment of women in public address events.

In examining the evaluative criterion of research method, the *NFA Journal* dominated all other forensic journals in articles developed with quantification. Even though these articles may not employ complex or escape flawed statistical procedures, the attempt to use such quantification is worth noting. In all probability most forensic writers do not possess a strong background in quantitative methods and thus the scholarship usually incorporates descriptive or argumentative methods. Individual events coaches, on the other hand, are emerging without a graduate school experience with argumentation theory and may therefore, lean towards alternative methodological procedures.

In 1983, David Thomas suggested that future research into forensics should emanate from ethnomethodological bases such as field studies, case studies, and discourse analysis. Thomas's suggestion seems to have gone unnoticed by individual events writers.

The final criterion of generalizability or social utility is perhaps even more problematic than the lack of quantitative or ethnographic methods. Our findings in this final criterion raises the question of whether the forensic laboratory is worthy of its own body of research. Rieke and Brock (1975) speculated that forensics may be defended on the grounds that students were provided a popular activity. In addition, they suggested that introspective research about forensics was justified because it examined the activity and offered suggestions for refinement. This position describes the direction of the vast majority of forensic research—researchers examine what is being done and attempt to make refinements. Rieke and Brock rebuke this "persistence in defining forensics as the engaging in a particular set of activities" for this tendency "deeply influences the character of scholarship in the field" (p. 137). Cox (1975) similarly noted that "the daily concerns of an active forensics program affects the saliency of research questions" (p. 137). To argue that the forensic "laboratory" is an acceptable field of study has a hollow ring to it.

The anecdotal evidence abounds where forensic research would not suffice for tenure purposes or for graduate theses or dissertations. Many speech communication departments have disbanded their forensic programs. If the forensic researchers were contributing knowledge to the larger body of communication research, this repudiation by the field might not be so vigorous. Even within the forensic community, what CEDA writers chose to elaborate on has little value for individual events coaches and vice versa.

Logue and Shea (1989) describe the movement of *JAFA* (now *Argumentation and Advocacy)* and the Summer Argumentation Conferences towards researching argumentation as the writing on the wall for forensic scholars. Because of its generalizability and the rich rhetorical

tradition of our discipline, the legitimacy of argumentation research is more readily granted. Those undertaking research projects that address questions of a qualitative nature may be well advised to consider an argumentative approach.

A recent individual events study in an international journal (Yoshihisa Itaba, 1990) points out that such research might be generalized beyond oratorical speaking. Using comparative criteria, the researcher examined American oratories with those of Japanese students. The current issue of cultural diversity emerges as a defining characteristic out of these speaking styles. Such research contributes to our intercultural understanding, a much broader research accomplishment than the mere description of a tournament practice or a suggestion for improving such a practice. This type of scholarship would not deserve Zarefsky's (1980) charge that the myopic focus of forensic research makes it trivial in scope and limited to participants in the contest activities described.

The individual events research of the 1990s can continue to be limited in scope or can heed the serious charges made here and elsewhere (Harris, Kropp, & Rosenthal, 1986). A true individual events laboratory could discover the validity of numerous speech communication questions: does organization matter to audience members; to what extent do source citations need to be complete for believability; what levels of memorization in delivery adds or detracts from message generation; is the podium a barrier to be avoided; what role does clothing have on credibility?

The gender research spawned by Friedley and Manchester has substantial potential for the communication field. Such research attempts to address such vital, and generalizable questions as: why do women avoid certain events; and are there other, more feminine, forms of communication that should be promoted in the forensic laboratory?

In keeping with the core issues, we recommend that researchers might address the following in future studies: what skills are learned in individual events competition; should students be learning to communicate more via mediated channels; how much practice is necessary to get competency is speaking to a given standard; how are research skills enhanced in individual events training and what do former competitors claim about their speech training as it applies to their current vocation?

In the area of evaluation of speeches, we know very little about the decision making of critics. Whether lay critics emphasize some aspects of the performance over others; do expert judges have judging paradigms by which they approach individual events; and what are the deciding factors between higher ranks over others?

Research about the students engaged in this activity, the effectiveness of form beyond the competitive realm, and the decision-making processes of critics should be the broad areas of individual events scholarship for the 1990s.

References

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

Andersen, K E. (1966). Quantitative research in debate. *Journal of the American Forensic Association,* 112-115.

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

Boone, G.M. (1987). The use of metaphorical topoi in impromptu training. *National Forensic Journal,* 39-48.

Colbert, K.R. (1988). A quantitative analysis of CEDA speaking rates. *National Forensic Journal,* 103-120.

Cox, J.R. (1975). Research and scholarship in forensics. In J.H. McBath (Ed.), *Forensics as communication* (p. 137). Skokie, IL: National Textbook.

Gotcher, J.M., & Honeycutt, J.M. (1989). An analysis of imagined interactions of forensic participants. *National Forensic Journal,* 1-19.

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

Itaba, Y. (1990). Japan-U.S. intercollegiate winning orations: A comparative study of persuasive strategies. *Speech Communication Education,* 91-104.

Knutson, T.J. (1979). Criticism of communication research: An introduction to quality control. *Central States Speech Journal,* 1-3.

Lee, R., & Lee, K.K. (1987). Implicit pedagogical theories of debate: Patterns of forensic philosophy. In J.W. Wenzel (Ed.), *Argument and critical practices: Proceedings of the Fifth SCA/AFA Conference on Argumentation* (pp. 351-358). Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association.

Logue, B. J. (1988). Forensic research: Criteria for criticism. Paper presented at Eastern Communication Association Convention, Baltimore, MD.

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.

McBath, J. H. (Ed.). (1975). *Forensics as communication.* Skokie, IL: National Textbook.

McBath, J. H. (1984). Rationale for forensics. In D. Parson (Ed.), *American forensics in Perspective* (pp. 5-11). Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Communication.

McBath, J. H., Bartanen, M., & Gossett, J. (1979). Research in forensics. ACA Bulletin, 5-9.

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

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

Murphy, J. M. (1989). Separate and unequal: Women in the public address events. *National Forensic Journal,* 115-126.

Rieke, R. D., & Brock, B. L. (1975). Research and scholarship in forensics. In J. H. McBath (Ed.), *Forensics as communication* (pp. 129-136). Skokie, IL: National Textbook.

Thomas, D. (1980). Sedalia plus five: Forensics as laboratory. In J. Rhodes & Sara Newell (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Summer Conference on Argumentation* (pp. 245-257). Annandale, VA: SCA/AFA.

Thomas, D. (1983). Research in forensics from the past five years: Trends, omissions, and recommendations. Paper presented at at Speech Communication Convention, Washington, D.C.

Tucker, R. K., Weaver, R. L., & Berryman-Fink, C. (1981). *Research in speech communication.* Englewood Clifss, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Verlinden, J. (1987). The metacritical model for judging interpretation events. *National Forensic Journal,* 57-66.

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

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

Zarefsky, D. (1980). Argumentation and forensics. In J. Rhodes & S. Newell (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Summer Conference on Argumentation* (pp. 20-25). Annandale, VA: SCA/AFA.

ENCOURAGING FORENSICS PEDAGOGY

*Kevin W. Dean**

Every year since I began coaching individual events, I have been fortunate to work with a group of eager novices. While I count forensic "rookies" a blessing, they are exceedingly time consuming: hour upon hour is absorbed simply by teaching and re-teaching them the basics of various events. The problem was crystallized for me several years ago by a frantic phone call form a colleague at a nearby college. He had just been appointed director of forensics, was unfamiliar with the events, and was in search of some written information in the field so that he might familiarize himself with the basics; could I recommend something? To my dismay and embarrassment, I found precious little in the way of "forensics pedagogy" which could quell his anxiety, simply because there was precious little "forensics pedagogy" to be found.

Establishing a body of literature which highlights pedagogical issues in forensics, particularly in the area of individual events, must be a priority for educators interested in applied communication activities.[1]

**National Forensic Journal* VIII (Spring 1990), pp. 29-36.

KEVIN W. DEAN is an Assistant Professor and Director of Forensics in the Department of Speech Communication and Theatre at West Chester State University, West Chester, PA, 19380. A version of this paper was presented at the 1988 SCA Convention.

[1]While collegiate-forensics pedagogy of any sort is scant, that directed towards individual events is especially lacking. Debate, being a more standard part of traditional communication curriculum at colleges and universities, has had much greater focus. Several texts (Freeley, Austin. *Argumentation and Debate.* 7th ed. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, 1990; Ziegelmueller, George E., et. al. *Argumentation Inquiry and Advocacy.* 2nd ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice, 1990; Lee, Ronald E. and Karen King Lee. *Arguing Persuasively.* NY: Longman, 1989; Pfau, Michael, et. al. *Debate and Argument* Glenview, IL: Scott, 1987; Thomas, David A. and Jack Hart, eds. *Advanced Debate.* Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook, 1987; Rieke, Richard D. and Malcolm O. Sillars. *Argumentation.* 2nd ed. Glenview, IL: Scott, 1984; and Sheckels, Theodore. *Debating.* NY: Longman, 1984, to name a few) offer fine attention to pedagogical issues relating to debate. To my knowledge, no counter part in individual events or "advanced public speaking" geared towards students in higher education exists.

Journal articles have been more fruitful than college texts in providing coaching strategies. See: Levasseur, David G. and Kevin W. Dean. "A Defense of Questions in Rhetorical Criticism." *National Forensic Journal* 7 (1989): 133-141; Kay, Jack and Roger Aden. "Clarifying Tournament Rhetorical Criticism: A Proposal for New Rules and Standards." *National Forensic Journal 1* (1989): 29- 42; Selnow, Timothy L. and George Ziegelmueller. "The Persuasive Speaking Contest: An Analysis of Twenty Years of Change." *National Forensic Journal* 6 (1988): 75-88; Aden, Roger C. and Jack Kay. "Improving the Educational Value of Extemporaneous Speaking: Refocusing the Question." *National Forensic Journal* 6 (1988): 43-50; Swarts, Valerie R. "The Function of the Introduction in Competitive Oral Interpretation." *National Forensic Journal* 6 (1988): 35-42; Hanson, Colan T. "Judging After Dinner Speaking: Identifying the Criteria for Evaluation." *National Forensic Journal* 6 (1988): 25-34; Murphy, John M. "Theory and Practice in Communication Analysis." *National Forensic Journal* 6 (1988):

Specifically, this essay will stress the merit of articles designed to instruct. For the purpose of this article, I will define pedagogy to include those works which describe instructional practices as they pertain to both forensics activities and similar communication events occurring in other contexts.

Academic stigma aside (and let's admit it: this is one), published guidelines for coaching strategies can be tremendously valuable for competitors and coaches alike. I will discuss four benefits of such literature here. First, pedagogical works can extend the value of forensics beyond the tournament, thus encompassing a variety of contexts and audiences. To those who decry forensics as "just a game," pedagogical research verifies the perception in the academic community that forensics does in fact offer solid educational experiences. Unlike analytical journals which tend to emphasize theory, forensics pedagogical inquiry

1-11; Dean, Dean, Kevin W. "Time Well Spent: Preparation for Impromptu Speaking." *Journal of the American Forensic Association* 23 (1987): 210-219; Dreibelbis, Gary C. and Kent R. Redmon. "But Seriously Forks... Considerations for Writing the Competitive After Dinner Speech." *National Forensic Journal* 5 (1987): 95-103; Reynolds, Christina L. and Mitchell Fay. "Competitive Impromptu Speaking." *National Forensic Journal* 5 (1987): 81-94; Ballinger, Bradley J. and Jeffrey D. Brand. "Persuasive Speaking: A Review to Enhance the Educational Experience." *National Forensic Journal* 5 (1987): 49-54; Boone, Gloria M. "The Use of Metaphorical Topoi in Impromptu Training." *National Forensic Journal* 5 (1987): 39-47; Harris, Edward J., Jr. "Judge Demographics and Criteria for Extemp and Impromptu at N.F.A. Nationals." *National Forensic Journal* 4 (1986): 135-147; Holloway, Hal, et. al. "Oral Interpretation in Forensic Competition: Representative Papers." *National Forensic Journal* 4 (1986): 53-73; Larson, Suzanne. "Communication Analysis: A Survey Research Report." *National Forensic Journal* 3 (1985): 140-153; Rosenthal, Robert E. "Changing Perspectives on Rhetorical Criticism as a Forensic Event." *National Forensic Journal* 3 (1985): 128-138; Dean, Kevin W. "Coaching Contest Rhetorical Criticism." *National Forensic Journal* 3 (1985): 116- 127; Shields, Donald C. and C. Thomas Preston Jr. "Fantasy Theme Analysis in Competitive Rhetorical Criticism." *National Forensic Journal* 3 (1985): 102-115; German, Kathleen M. "Finding a Methodology for Rhetorical Criticism." *National Forensic Journal* 3 (1985): 86-101; Geisler, Deborah M. "Modern Interpretation Theory and Competitive Forensics: Understanding Hermeneutic Text." *National Forensic Journal* 3 (1985): 71-79; Bytwerk, Randall L. "Impromptu Speaking Exercises." *Communication Education* 34 (1985): 148-149; Dean, Kevin W. and William L. Benoit. "A Categorical Content Analysis of Rhetorical Criticism Ballots." *National Forensic Journal* 2 (1984): 99-108; Crawford, John E. "Toward Standardized Extemporaneous Speech Competition: Tournament Design and Speech Training." *National Forensic Journal* 2 (1984): 41-55; Mills, Norbert H. "Judging the After Dinner Speaking Competitor Style and Content." *National Forensic Journal* 2 (1984): 11-18; Benson, James A. and Sheryl A. Friedley. "An Empirical Analysis of Evaluation Criteria for Persuasive Speaking." *Journal of the American Forensic Association* 29 (1982): 1-13; Thompson, Wayne N. "The Contest in Rhetorical Criticism." *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta* 66 (1981): 17-19, 31; and Benson, James A. "Extemporaneous Speaking: Organization Which Inheres." *Journal of the American Forensic Association* 24 (1978): 150-155. While these articles do contain useful information few offer explicit advice for students, detailing procedures for tackling the various events. Additionally, the subject matter for the majority of the articles focus on rhetorical criticism while attention to other contest events is either scant or nonexistent.

offers conclusions derived from a field of applied research. Pedagogical works can offer means with which to test theory in practice, specifically in the forensics context. Such application provides fodder for broader investigation of the role various aspects of oral communication plays in applied fields such as law, business, science, and education.

A second benefit of pedagogical study is the advancement of the forensics activity itself. Research begets greater sophistication and a wider range of communication possibilities available to rhetorical practice. Pedagogical research probes the relationships between coach, student, and event; thus, it inevitably shapes the direction of the activity. Research enlivens the forensics community as it challenges those involved in the activity to respond with a greater awareness of communication nuances.

Third, instructional materials supply a common language that equips individuals with a common theoretical foundation, from which a more detailed discussion can develop. Coaches and students who enter into a coaching relationship already versed in the basic components of literary analysis of poetry, fundamental organizational patterns for impromptu speaking, or various forms of humor and their application to after dinner speaking, increase the likelihood that coaching time is more effectively spent on fine tuning the student's insights on a given forensics event.

Related to this advantage is a final, practical benefit to pedagogical study. Printed instructional materials are time efficient coaching tools. Coaches often expend countless hours explaining the rudimentaries of contest events and basic approaches to communication that—one would hope—could be covered in an introductory public speaking or oral interpretation course. While suggesting that coaches and students read basic public speaking and oral interpretation texts is not a bad move, the fact is that a forensics contest is a unique rhetorical situation, complete with its own unique exigencies and audience. Textbooks rarely address this "laboratory setting," and therefore frustrate beginning students who find they must adapt textbook advice to the tournament setting. Written resources, specific to a forensics audience and digested prior to individual appointments between student and coach, enable coach and student to concentrate on refinement during coaching sessions rather than reviewing rudimentaries. Moreover, pedagogical works dedicated to coaching strategies stimulate creative and personalized coaching approaches as coaches and students appropriate the suggestions of others, and adapt them to suit their own personal styles.

Information Void

Searching for instructional materials is not an easy task. The request for information from the colleague I mentioned above came in 1984. My investigation produced only one article in the *Journal of the American Forensic Association* which was instructional in nature. It was a fine work on extemporaneous speaking, written in 1978 by James Benson.[2] The remaining published sources I was able to locate came from books and monographs directed towards high school forensics, debate, or communication methods books designed for teacher education.[3] What is disturbing about these works is the scant attention given to individual events and the vagueness with which the information is presented. Ultimately, the one to two sentence event descriptions contained in many college tournament invitations provide about as much valuable information to prepare students for the event as do these published resources.

Convention papers form SCA were also of little help. A quick glance through the topics of papers presented at Forensics/NFA sponsored programs at SCA from 1982-1989 proves that attention has focused more on judging/performance standards (e.g., "Are Women More Successful in Extemporaneous Speaking Than Men?" and "What Judges Look For In After Dinner") and philosophical arguments (e.g., "Must There Be A Need To Know In Informative Speaking?" or "Crossing The Fine Line in Oral Interpretation") than on articles that instruct. Furthermore, in the past eight years there has only been one SCA short course sponsored by the Forensics/NFA.[4]

It is not my intention to imply that pedagogical support for the forensics community is to be considered "prescriptive" medicine. Indeed, forensics activities have been justifiably criticized for unnecessarily constraining traditions-become-mandates: the "serious point" and "need to know" steps, "cookie cutter applications of methodologies," unyielding demands for manuscripts in interpretation events. Rather, it is my hope that the information presented here will justify the usefulness of instructional forensics research and encourage more

---

[2]Benson 150-155.

[3]See: Faules, Don F. et. al. *Directing Forensics.* Denver: Morton, 1976; Newcombe, P Judson and Karl F. Robinson. *Teaching Speech Communication in the Secondary School.* NY: McKay, 1975; Brooks, William D. et. al. *Teaching Speech Communication in the Secondary School.* Boston: Houghton, 1973; and Klopf, Donald W. and Carroll P. Lahmann. *Coaching and Directing Forensics.* Scokie, IL: National Textbook, 1967.

[4]William L. Benoit, Kevin W. Dean, and Daniel J. O'Rourke. "Coaching Competitive Rhetorical Criticism." SCA Short Course. Washington, D.C. November 10, 1983. It should be noted that SCA has announced acceptance of a Rhetorical Criticism Short Course for the 1990 Chicago convention which will be conducted by Kevin W. Dean, Kathleen M. German, and David G. Levasseur.

of it. What follows is a description of the process I have found useful in drafting articles dealing with instructional/coaching practices for individual events.

Procedure

Instructional articles in forensics, of course, are not procedurally different from any other descriptive study. As with any article, delineating a clear thesis and one's intended audience are musts. Roderick Hart has identified these two reasons as common justifications for an editor to reject a public address article.[5] Hopefully, the standards for publication in forensics will remain equally high.

Another "given" is that the goal of forensics pedagogy should be, in some way, to enrich the educational experience of the activity. Often the most useful writings are grounded in actual coaching experiences with students. These works address such questions as: what do students need to know about a given event to get started? what do students want to know about a given event? what information have I as coach provided to former students that has both clarified a concept and stimulated new interest and creative thinking? Questions like these help the writer to provide information that will be educationally useful and challenging to the reader.

A third procedural assumption is that the author will identify some target audience. While both *Argumentation and Advocacy* (formerly the *Journal of the American Forensic Association)* and the *National Forensic Journal* are directed towards professionals in the discipline (presumably coaches and instructors of argumentation, persuasion, public speaking, and forensics activities) the forensics "market share" may be narrowed by directing one's discussion toward issues affecting novices, varsity competitors, or both. Realistically few students read (let alone subscribe to) forensics journals, but educationally-minded coaches can make students aware of these resources. At this point it may be most effective to write with coaches in mind so that they, in turn, can pass information on to students. As common practice, I have distributed the previously cited Benson article to students interested in extemporaneous speaking and followed with a discussion of the main points developed in the article. I test my own work with students before sending it to journals, and—judging from editorial critiques I have received—apparently reviewers for both AFA and NFA sponsored journals have also shared work with their students to obtain feedback regarding the value/usability of a given article. Such feedback is vital, since ultimately it is

[5]Roderick P. Hart, "Contemporary Scholarship in Public Address: A Research Editorial." *Western Journal of Speech Communication* 50 (1986): 283-295.

the student practioner who must be able to synthesize, process and eventually integrate the information if it is to be of any real value.

Once the research question and target audience have been selected, it is useful to investigate the existing literature. At present this is a short journey. Yet documentation is crucial; turning to sources such as contemporary public speaking books, oral performance texts, or articles on communication theory to support pedagogical claims not only strengthens arguments; it is a strategy which integrates forensics with the curricular base from which the activity developed. If forensics is to maintain its integrity as a valuable communication activity, it must be constantly associated with current research in the field as a whole.

Since pedagogy articles tend to be descriptive in nature, they are enhanced when an author uses vivid illustrations to support claims. Indeed, illustration has been the pedagogical *piece de resistance* since Plato's cave. However, suggesting irony in after dinner, focal points in prose, or a visualization step in persuasion is helpful only insofar as readers are familiar with irony, focal points, or visualizations. Modeling has long been recognized as an effective educational tool—and where better than from the numerous students we coach can we glean illustrations of effective and ineffective choices that were made in the conception, construction, and presentation of public performances?

Presumably, a researcher who articulated a clear thesis, an educational purpose, an identifiable audience, a summary of existing literature on the topic, and vivid illustrations would now find herself with an article that is well-written—and that is a place to start. The true insight for the reader, however, comes neither in the claims made or the supporting illustrations used, but in the author's analysis: the explanations of "why" s/he is making the suggestion in the first place. Explaining "why literary introductions are effective in impromptu speaking," for example, makes more educational sense than simply stating, "Literary introductions are effective in impromptu speaking." For instance, one might support the claim that literary introductions are effective because they:

- tend to enhance a speaker's *ethos* by demonstrating that the speaker is well-read;
- highlight a speaker's uniqueness and thus enable the speaker to become more memorable to the audience;
- provide a simple connecting point for a conclusion.

In this way the author explains the educational impact of the claim that "literary introductions are effective." In short, attention to the "why" question sharpens the analysis of the work and moves it beyond the "cookie cutter" level of scholarship.

Conclusion

Published research in communication is notable for its lack of pedagogical works relating to forensics. Yet, coaches and students could greatly benefit from resources which build a common language, add efficiency to coaching sessions, and stimulate coaching creativity. Pedagogical articles written with a clear purpose for a specified audience, and which are supported by existing communication research and theory, provide an academically sound foundation for a skills-oriented article. Like any forensics speech, published forensic pedagogy is strengthened by vivid illustrations and, most importantly, by analysis that probes "why" a given suggestion is offered. No "how-to" article should be viewed as an end product; rather, it serves as thought-provoking fodder for coaches and students who may use or adapt its strategies in their own forensics experience.

The forensics community will be enriched by pedagogical research in all of the individual forensics events. Works targeting novice and varsity, students and coaches, highlighting coaching nuances for the research, structure, and presentation of various events are all obvious places to begin. But additional creative avenues for pedagogical study are also to be encouraged. One virtually untapped area is the historical antecedents upon which our current forensics practices are found. Another potential research direction might draw links between descriptive qualities of the various tournament events and similar communication forms existing in other contexts. A paper might, for instance, juxtapose a discussion of contest persuasion speeches against trial summations, news editorials, or religious sermons. Another might compare the use of support material in contest extemporaneous speeches to that found in political debates. The possibilities of extending our educational practices and theories into broader contexts is limitless.

The void in literature addressing forensics pedagogy is, therefore, both a concern and an opportunity. It is a concern because the forensics activity is weakened without it. It is an opportunity because it is a "wide open" field ready and eager for scholarship which will meet the need.

Academicians are accustomed to assuming that pedagogical studies are somehow less reputable that other research areas. Fortunately such avenues as *Communication Education, The Speech Communication Teacher,* and *ERIC* exist to counter these charges. However, to date these publications have largely ignored the forensics community. Leaders in forensics have recognized this need for pedagogical research and calls have been made at developmental conferences to meet the challenge; yet few have responded. The *Journal of the American Forensic*

Association made a noteworthy exception by devoting its Spring 1987 issue to pedagogical concerns. As editor McKerrow noted, "There is active interest in sharing knowledge about the practical as well as theoretical issues involved in teaching and coaching."[6] Just as communication educators find value in instructional articles in communication education, the forensics community can appreciate the usefulness of such "practical" works. We need to go further by increasing our attention and active research in this area and broadening our scope of publication sources to include such works as *Communication Education.* We need to continue "special issues" in our national forensics journals and encourage our colleagues who have innovative coaching styles to submit their work for review.

[6]Ray McKerrow, "Forensics as Pedagogy: An Editorial Note," *Journal of the American Forensic Association* 23 (1987): 183.

IN SEARCH OF LIBRARY HORROR STORIES: AN EXAMINATION OF RESEARCH CRITICAL TO PUBLIC ADDRESS EVENTS IN FORENSICS

*Joseph M. Callow, Jr. **

For anyone who has participated in forensics and individual events, the library has become a second home. Interpers can spend days trying to find pieces and poems, extempers regularly catch up on the weekly events changing the world around us, and of course, public address people work diligently on research. While public address is a combination of delivery and information, the latter is often the least considered. The forensics adage, "it's not what you say, but how you say it," inherently emphasizes style over substance; and while both are theoretically important, I believe judges and competitors alike need to remind themselves of the importance of good research. By first, looking at the problems and pitfalls of research; and then, identifying some of the reasons for the need of good research, all of us associated with individual events can reflect on why the hours of time spent with our eyes focused at black print on white paper have not gone to waste.

Any good speech starts with a good topic, and whether your topic is simple or complex, common or uncommon, narrow or far-reaching, research is the difference between a good topic and a good speech. Trying to find that research, however, is no easy task, and three basic problems and pitfalls exist in research: relying on one source, plagiarizing other sources, and failing to do one's own research.

Archimedes once said, "give me a firm place from which to stand and I will move the world,"; well, in forensics, give a student one good article with a lot of good internal source citations and a public address is born. Let's fact it—it is really not that hard to do. *National Geographic* or a *Popular Science* cover story easily provides enough information for a solid informative; one *60 Minutes* episode can give you a strong persuasion, complete with problem, reasons for problem, dead bodies, solution for problem, and at least one gut-wrenching, sob story for an introduction and conclusion; even *Vogue* and *Cosmopolitan* can provide the impetus for an after dinner speech, including a rough outline and cute definitions. Situations abound that are tempting and easy ways to avoid doing research and pitching a tent in the library.

'National Forensic Journal, VIII, (Spring, 1990), pp. 39-43.

JOSEPH M. CALLOW, JR., is first year law year student at the University of Cincinnati Law School, Cincinnati, Ohio. Mr. Callow graduated in 1990 from Miami University of Ohio where he competed four years on the Miami Forensics Team, and was a national finalist in numerous events.

Unfortunately (or fortunately), this approach to public address has two big problems. First, most judges and competitors, at least good judges and competitors, can tell if a speech is from one source. Either you cite the same source over and over again, or you don't cite any sources at all—the forensics' version of "damned if you do, damned if you don't."

Second, most current articles that provide such great information and make wonderful topics have more than likely been seen by others on the circuit, including judges. People who do research recognize topics they themselves have seen, and often know the same articles and same information. If it is a new articles about an "old" topic, judges and experienced competitors can probably stand up and give a synopsis of the speech themselves. If it is that great an article, in and of itself, chances are someone else has done it, is doing it, or there will be so many speeches out on the topic one source simply won't cut it.

While we all hope to find *"The Article"* that will make our speech, a good researcher knows it will take more than one article, more than one perspective to make his/her case. It will take time in the library, discussions with librarians, and an understanding of the resources available; it will take research, rough drafts, critiques, re-research, re-critiques, and countless rewrites to make a speech successful.

Even if we are able to find the sources needed for a quality speech, there lurks the familiar and recurring problem of plagiarism. In recent months, numerous studies have appeared in various journals highlighting the problem of plagiarism on college campuses, and the forensics world has certainly not been devoid of it's own controversies as well. While reasons for plagiarism range from being too lazy to rewrite information to being too arrogant in thinking no one will check false sources, I believe some plagiarism occurs because it is difficult to make research sound like part of a speech. There are only so many times you can say "according to...", "...reports" and "...concludes" without getting redundant and boring.

The ability to incorporate and cite information within an address is a skill that often separates good speeches from great speeches; it is one of those intangibles that goes unnoticed if done well, but remains a constant comment on judge's ballots if ignored. With the emphasis on "how you say it" over "what you say," the trap is there to make inferential leaps, gloss over and ignore problems, or even plagiarize information rather than answering questions with research that might be difficult to incorporate. The integrity of the argument is sacrificed to preserve the polish and grace of delivery; it is easier to plagiarize the information within the speech rather than working to incorporate the source citations. This type of plagiarism reflects the easy way out rather than

learning one of the finer skills of forensics, a definite problem that only hurts the forensics circuit.

Beyond the problems of lack of research and plagiarism, there also exists the problem of not doing one's own research. It is one thing for a fellow competitor, teammate, or coach to give an article to another person; it is a problem when that person incorporates the information into that person's speech. It is one the thing to work with coaches on critiques and rewrites; it is another for a competitor to enter a coaching appointment, be handed a speech, and simply start the memorization process.

While there is no way to determine how prevalent the problem is, the amount of scuttlebutt and gossip that exists on the circuit concerning the problem is too overwhelming to ignore. The benefits of doing one's own research are too obvious to enumerate (although I'll mention some later), but there are some who apparently disregard them. Too often, it is apparent that a competitor really doesn't know what he/she is talking about, and is merely reciting somebody else's words rather than informing, persuading, or critically analyzing. The problem manifests itself as eight to ten minutes of basically wasted time for competitors and judges alike, with no one learning anything.

Now by no means do I wish to diminish the importance of delivery and style in public address, and I don't want to argue that substance is more important than style. I believe the best speech has a balance of both elements, and that balance can only be achieved by elevating our concerns for research. Currently, though, there are definite problems in how we view research, and how it relates to individual events. There is a definite importance to research beyond merely proving to someone that you know how to use a card catalogue or a periodical index. Research has some definite, positive effects on forensics, and of the many reasons for good research in public address, three of them are worth noting here.

First, good research ensures that we know what we are talking about. Whether our purpose is to inform, persuade, entertain, or analyze, our primary, ethical responsibility is to be knowledgeable ourselves. Good research ensures that we know more than what fits into a neat, ten-minute oration; that we are aware of conflicting stories, of problems, of other information that allows us to be knowledgeable speakers. One of the greatest feelings in forensics is when someone is interested enough in what you have to say, that they ask you for more information; and there is nothing more fulfilling than to have that information for them.

Second, the research skills that we learn in forensics helps us as students in all parts of our academic life. The organization and research

skills that public address emphasizes are skills that professors demand and employers need. The ability to find good, solid research, and then know how to convey that research to others, is a valuable tool in the academic and corporate worlds.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, good research makes forensics enjoyable, and makes the events worthwhile. Often, I was asked why I did forensics—why someone would want to give up nearly every weekend of their college career to spend time at other college campuses with a small group of people and "talk" about "stuff." It is a very good question, and one I think anyone who participates in forensics needs to ask himself/herself. Every competitor needs to ask why he/she does forensics, and more pertinent to this article, why does he/she want to do public address. With ten to twelve events available each week, why does someone want to devote hours upon hours of time, work, coaching appointments, and determination to a topic?

Whether I was writing an informative, persuasion, rhetorical criticism, or an after dinner speech, I participated in forensics because it was enjoyable, and I did public address because in every speech, I had researched information that I wanted other people to know. Good research keeps judges curious, other competitors interested, and makes people want to come back next week and see how a speech changes over time.

A good researcher makes use of judges' ballots. Every week, a competitor gets a ballot back that reads, "need some research/information/ source citations for this point." While some ballots are good, some not so good, they do serve a purpose. If we do nothing with judges' ballots but check and make sure the scores match those on the tabulation sheets, we are missing out. Judges' ballots give you a feel for what people want to hear, and this needs to be encompassed with what you as a competitor want to say. What research needs to be included, where it should go, and what information could be emphasized are questions that an individual and judges input can help answer. This process of communication between judge and contestant is what makes forensics worthwhile, research important, and keeps the competitor involved in the events. Because I think forensics is a worthwhile endeavor, I believe doing quality research is a basic commitment to keeping public address alive and healthy. Using one source for a speech, plagiarizing, or letting others do my work would only harm the events, hurt the learning process, and make them unenjoyable for everyone. If we are going to take so much time out of our lives to participate, the least we can do is take the time to prepare.

I am sure there are veteran forensicators around the country that have "library horror stories" to tell, and I think that is great. It means

there are people out there attempting to do quality research, people willing to pitch a tent next to the card catalogue and settle in on the search for the research that will transform "the topic" into "the speech." By looking at the problems and pitfalls of public address research, and the reasons why good research is needed, I hope all concerned with individual events will spend a little more time emphasizing research and quality information, ensuring "library horror stories" concerning our home away from home will exist for many years to come.

GRADUATE STUDENTS AND FORENSIC RESEARCH

*Arnie Madsen**

Rieke and Brock briefly summarize one of the primary obstacles facing graduate student research in forensic theory and practice:

> Although directors of forensics may have advanced degrees in speech communication, their fields of graduate study usually were not argumentation, decision making, forensics, etc. Graduate study in rhetorical criticism and the history of public address, providing few if any courses in the above mentioned areas of investigation…graduate students exhibit a split personality. Deeply committed to forensics largely because of their participation in high school and college, they want to assume a faculty position as director of forensics, but find themselves intellectually engaged in studying other communication specialties (129-130).

As Rieke and Brock conclude, "students who do want to emphasize forensics-related studies at the graduate level have difficulty doing so" (130). This observation from 1975 continues to hold true in 1990. Even a cursory examination of the various forensic journals reveals a lack of student-conducted research. Few articles authored by graduate students appear in publications such as *Argumentation and Advocacy*, *CEDA Yearbook*, the *National Forensic Journal*, or the proceedings of the summer argumentation conferences.

This article suggests an increasing role for graduate student research in forensics. Initially considered are some of the problems with, and opportunities for, research in forensic theory and practice. The article concludes by examining the opportunities for graduate student research in forensics.

Wayne Thompson provides a common perspective on most of the research conducted on forensic practice:

> Perhaps no potentially major area for quantitative study in the speech field has produced research so banal and provincial as has debate. Most of the studies have dealt with intercollegiate competition, and the principal secondary interest has been the effects and the values. These investigations, although of considerable interest to student debaters and coaches, do not illuminate general psychological or rhetorical issues (qtd. in Rieke and Brock 131).

Others continue this general indictment. Walwik suggests "research in our field has been limited and often of dubious quality" (43). Andersen argues "recent research conducted in the area of debate and forensics has no interest in and no generalizability beyond that narrow situation" (155). McGlone's charge is researchers "have investigated contest debating alone and produced findings with limited or no applicability

**National Forensic Journal* VIII (Spring 1990), pp. 45-49.
ARNIE MADSEN is a doctoral candidate in the Department of Communication Studies at Northwestern University, Evanston, IL 60208.

beyond the subjects who were actually involved in the research" (54). Zarefsky indicated "a myopic focus on 'forensic activities' makes the research which is done relatively trivial in scope" (22). As Logue and Shea conclude, "the forensic laboratory is an important concept, but the scholarship that has been generated about it has little utility beyond the competitive forensic event about which it was written" (454).

A variety of areas for future research in forensics exists. The report on the National Developmental Conference on Forensics outlined several research questions, most of which remain unanswered (35-36). There are at least four discrete areas in which to focus future research efforts. Those include research on real-world applications of forensics, and studies on argumentation theory, forensics pedagogy, and tournament practice.

1. **Real-World Applications.** A common concern of those indicting forensic research is that real-world application of forensic practice should increase. Andersen's review of forensic research concludes there is "less and less study of argumentation in the wide range of real-life settings in which it occurs" (155). Walwik issues a call for more research to measure and evaluate the relationship between the academic world of forensic practice and the real world (45). Polk suggests such study would "aid in determining the relevance of academic forensic training to speaking and decision making in the non-academic world" (40). In this manner, McBath, Bartanen, and Gossett state:

> There is an obvious call for research efforts into substantive debate, the application of argumentative principles to fields outside academe. The kind of quality of research activity in legal argumentation can be extended to government, politics, advertising, industry, judiciary, volunteer associations, and wherever else people use reason giving as justification for acts, beliefs, attitudes, and values (qtd. in Thomas, "Sedalia" 252-253).

McGlone proposes several research areas related to forensic training and its relationship to other endeavors. He includes the effects of debate as a decision-making process, whether forensics fosters the development of extemporaneous speaking skills, does forensics improve reasoning and critical thinking, and whether forensics participation increases the ability to research efficiently (54).

2. **Argumentation Theory.** The Sedalia conferees argued that unless an ongoing process of research occurs, the discipline of forensics could atrophy, becoming a closed system (15). As such, there is a continuing need to conduct research into the theoretical assumptions of forensic practice. Not only should the classical roots of the discipline receive continued examination, but changes in those assumptions dictated by the post-modern world should also undergo scrutiny.

Included in this area is a possibility for increased interdisciplinary research in forensics. Sedilia recognized that theoretical advances from other disciplines could have important implications for forensic theory. Notable examples of such research in the debate literature include the incorporation of policy systems analysis, hypothesis testing, and games theory as paradigms of debate. Similarly, forensics researchers should attempt to increase the application of their studies to other disciplines, as outlined in the previous discussion of real-world application of argumentation theory.

3. **Forensics Pedagogy.** An often neglected area of research centers around pedagogical concerns (Logue and Shea 453). While the *Forensic Educator* and a recent issue of the *Journal of the American Forensic Association* (23:4) both consider pedagogic concerns, more work remains to be done in this area. Several research opportunities exist related to forensics pedagogy. For example, what are the effects of various learn ing methods on forensics training (classroom lecture, tournament practice, summer institutes, etc.)? How does forensic training effect personality development, critical thinking, and communication skills? What variables influence judging decisions, and what is the reliability and validity of those decisions (McBath 36)?

4. Tournament Practice. One of the Sedilia recommendations was that an increase in research into tournament practices should occur (32). The report of the Second National Developmental Conference on Forensics suggests "while new events and formats can enhance the educational value of forensics, innovation should not preclude evaluation of *current* events and formats" (44). Smith ("Format" and "Theory") suggests several possible avenues of research in this area. Additionally, there continues to be concern over the actual relationship between forensic theory and tournament practice.

Opportunities for graduate student research exist in each of these four areas. Similarly, there are a variety of outlets available to students for such studies. Initially, graduate programs should follow the Sedilia recommendation and encourage more master's theses and doctoral dissertations on argumentation and forensics. As the Sedilia report suggests, such research "furthers our understanding of people communicating arguments and concern" (38).

Second, graduate students should submit their research to various interest groups for presentation at state, regional, and national professional conventions. For example, several Speech Communication Association divisions and affiliated organizations are directly concerned with research in forensics. These include the following: the Forensics Division, American Forensic Association, Cross Examination Debate Association, National Forensic Association, Phi Rho Pi,

and Pi Kappa Delta. In addition, The Committee on Joint Appearances of Political Candidates, the Task Force on Presidential Communication, and the Commission on Communication and the Law, among others, provide potential convention outlets for real-world applications of forensic research.

Additionally, there are two other prime opportunities for graduate student presentations at conventions. The first of these is the Student Section. There are no topic restrictions on such research. The Student Section also solely considers studies conducted by students. Second, most divisions and affiliated organizations sponsor debut programs devoted to researchers who have never presented a paper at a national convention.

A third opportunity for dissemination of graduate student research is the variety of professional journals devoted to forensics. Such journals include *Argumentation and Advocacy,* the *CEDA Yearbook,* the *National Forensic Journal, Speaker and Gavel,* the *Forensic Educator,* and *The Forensic.* The prospect of having their research submitted to editorial scrutiny should not discourage graduate student research. As Logue and Shea indicate, "with so many forensic outlets, the problem is not one for a writer locating a publication, it is for editors finding quality manuscripts" (453).

Forensics researchers have a wealth of important issues on which to conduct future research. Andersen illustrates the importance of continuing research in forensic theory and practice:

> In an age of educational accountability, the forensics community is and will increasingly be called upon to tell what it seeks to do, how well it accomplishes its goals, and what other effects it has. Surprisingly, there seems little interest in such research at this time (155).

Graduate students are a prime group to engage in such studies. Not only will such research foster advances in the field of forensics, but it will also serve to increase the professional advancement of graduate students.

Works Cited

Andersen, Kenneth A. 'A Critical Review of the Behavioral Research in Argumentation and Forensics." *Journal of the American Forensic Association* 10 (1974): 147-155.

Logue, Brenda J., and B. Christine Shea. "An Examination and Criticism of Forensic Research: The Last Five Years: 1984-*1988." Spheres of Argument; Proceedings of the Sixth SCAIAFA Conference on Argumentation.* Ed. Bruce E. Gronbeck. Annandale: Speech Communication Association, 1989. 449-456. McBath, James H., ed.

Forensics as Communication: The Argumentative Perspective. Skokie: National Textbook, 1975.

McGlone, Edward L. "Toward Improved Quantitative Research in Forensics." *Journal of the American Forensics Association* 6 (1969): 49-54.

Parson, Donn, ed. *American Forensics in Perspective: Papers from the Second National Conference on Forensics.* Annandale: Speech Communication Association, 1984.

Polk, Lee R. "Historical Research in Forensics: Its Status and Guidelines for the Future." *Journal of the American Forensic Association* 7 (1970): 36-41.

Rieke, Richard D., and Bernard L. Brock. "Research and Scholarship in Forensics." *Forensics as Communication: The Argumentative Perspective.* Ed. James H. McBath. Skokie: National Textbook, 1975. 129-141.

Smith, Ross. "Format Theory." *Clarifying Water Policy.* Ed. Roger E. Solt. Winston-Salem: Debater's Research Guide, 1985. 15- 17.

_____"Theory and Practice: Studying Format Experimentation." Joint Central and Southern States Speech Association Convention. St. Louis, MO, April 1987.

Thomas, David A. "Research in Debate From the Past Five Years: Trends, Omissions, and Recommendations." *Advanced Debate: Readings in Theory, Practice and Teaching.* Ed. David A. Thomas and Jack Hart. 3rd ed. Skokie: National Textbook, 1987.

"Sedilia Plus Five: Forensics as Laboratory." *Proceedings of the Summer Confer ence on Argumentation.* Ed. Jack Rhodes and Sara Newell. Annandale: Speech Com munication Association, 1980. 245-257.

Wkhvik, Theodore J. "Research in Forensics: An Overview." *Journal of the American Forensic Association* 6 (1969): 43-48.

Zarefsky, David. 'Argument and Forensics." *Proceedings of the Summer Conference on Argumentation.* Ed. Jack Rhodes and Sara Newell. Annandale: Speech Communication Association. 1980. 20-25.

LIBRARY AND ARCHIVAL RESOURCES FOR FORENSICS RESEARCH

*by David Bickford**

Forensics research has traditionally been an empirical pursuit. Researchers have used tournament results sheets, video and audio recordings of actual rounds, judges' critiques, and other direct evidence to investigate trends in forensic competition. This reliance on direct, primary sources is a natural outgrowth of two characteristics.

First, many forms of forensic competition are quite young. The venerable tradition of the Interstate Oratorical Association is the exception rather than the rule; for the most part, the established forensics organizations, especially in individual events, are only a few decades old. As a result the organizations have not grown to the level of retaining huge bodies of historical data. There simply are not encyclopedic resources for forensics history which researchers, their departments, or university libraries can purchase. Researchers, without this level of documented historical background, have had to rely heavily on new data for their investigations.

Second, forensics is largely a world unto itself. No matter how much effort is made to model forensics to real world communications skills, the actual universe of coaches and students participating is small and tightly-knit. Information tends to be retained and transmitted more through oral tradition and informal records than in enduring, formally published materials. Even if enough data were available for detailed records of historical statistics in forensics, it is doubtful that a sufficient market would exist for professionally published reference materials. For a commercial publisher to be successful in publishing such a work, the price would have to be in the thousands of dollars. As a result, most research materials in existence are done by forensics practioners using the resources of their own institutions. Market realities currently prevent the expansion of forensics publishing to include a broader audience and the involvement of more outside publishers.

Since the relative youth and small size of much of the forensics community has forced a high degree of reliance of primary sources for forensics research, very little documentation exists of the secondary sources available. What will follow is a brief discussion of the emerging

---

**National Forensic Journal* VIII (Spring 1990), pp. 51-55.

DAVID BICKFORD is a former individual events competitor and national champion who is pursuing a career as a librarian in the Business and Sciences Department of the Phoenix Public Library (12 E. McDowell Rd., Phoenix, AZ, 85004). He also works and travels regularly with the Arizona State University forensics team.

secondary resources for forensics research and some suggestions of trends that may emerge.

To review the literature already in existence on a topic of interest in forensics, some manual searching, that is, paging through each issue of a given journal, is inevitable. Again, the relative youth and small size of much of the forensics community is at work here. So far, *Argumentation and Advocacy*[1] (formerly the *Journal of the American Forensic Association)* is the only publication devoted solely to forensics which is indexed. Previous articles in this journal may be assessed using the *Current Index to Journal in Education*[2], the *Index to Journals in Communication Studies Through 1985*,[3] or the online ERIC database[4], where retrieval by author, title, and most importantly for literature reviews, by subject is possible.

Unfortunately, other influential publications such as the *National Forensic Journal*, are not currently indexed. As a result, unless a citation paper trail has already been created by a reference to an article in another article, there is seldom no alternative to manual searching. This is not a serious problem at present since there are relatively few issues of this journal to search, but the need for indexing will undoubtedly increase as the body of forensics research increases in size.

The prospects for full inclusion of forensics literature in the research tools housed in most university libraries are still not terribly good. Although as forensics literature increases in its influence and audience the case for its inclusion in print and online databases will grow stronger, there is always the problem of confusion of subject matter. The medical discipline of forensics still draws by far the greater amount of attention, sometimes to the point of eclipsing speech and debate competition entirely. A notable example is found in the *Ulrich's International Periodicals Directory*,[5] a major reference tool used by librarians in identifying journals to purchase in a given subject area. *Argumentation and Advocacy* is listed in the education section, but before its name change, it appeared in the medical section of the directory! The *National Forensic Journal* is still classified under medicine. A

---

[1]*Argumentation and Advocacy,* published by the American Forensic Association, c/o James Pratt, Department of Speech Communication, University of Wisconsin—River Falls, 54022.

[2]*Current Index to Journal in Education,* published by Oryx Press, Phoenix, AZ, 85004.

[3]*Index to Journals in Communication Studies Through 1985,* Ronald J. Matlon, ed., published by the Speech Communication Association, 5105 Backlick Road, Building E, Annandale, VA., 22003.

[4] Available as file #1 through Dialogue Information Services, Palo Alto, CA.

[5]*Ulrich's International Periodicals Directory,* published annually by R.R. Bowker, New York, NY.

librarian or researcher attempting to identify journals in our field would miss this journal because of this error, and since no other forensics journals are listed, would not be able to identify any of the professional literature which coaches and graduate students rely on.

Until the forensics community is able to create a distinct academic identity, these problems will undoubtedly continue to limit traditional library access to forensics information. Secondary sources of information therefore have to be obtained less formally through direct contact with those individuals and organizations who have archived historical data on forensics. What follows below is a partial list of some of the existing sources of information.

Currently, the major forensic associations themselves are a worthwhile source of historical data. With varying degrees of completeness, the leagues and associations sponsoring national tournaments have records of previous tournament results and entries since their beginnings. In addition, regional associations which sponsor tournaments throughout the regular season, such as the Metropolitan Washington Communication Association, the Twin Cities Forensic League, the Great Eastern Tournaments, and others, can offer historical records of the tournaments they have sponsored.

In the past few years, organizations have added videotape records of the final rounds at national tournaments. While copyright problems currently prevents the taping of interpretation events, these videotapes, which are already widely used for instructional purposes, could also be of value in providing several consecutive years' worth of final round materials to be studied.

Two major works now compile data from several tournaments sponsored by different organizations to provide an historical record of an entire forensics season. Since 1986, the Speech Communication Association has published *Championship Debates and Speeches*,[6] an annual book which includes the transcripts of the final rounds of national debate tournaments and of winning speeches in individual events. In addition, whenever possible, judges' critiques of the winning speeches are included. A shift has begun in the past two years toward verbatim comments from the actual ballots instead of comments written after the tournament specifically for the publication.

While *Championship Debates and Speeches* and the videotapes provide an excellent overview of the text of championship speeches, one of the most thorough archival publications in forensics is devoted solely to tournament results and statistics. The *Intercollegiate Speech Tournament*

---

[6]*Championship Debates and Speeches*, edited by John K Boaz and James R. Brey, published by the Speech Communication Association, Annandale, VA.

Results[7] book, begun in 1961, provides an annual record of results for nearly all individual events, CEDA, NDT, and Lincoln-Douglas tournaments. Dr. Seth C. Hawkins of Southern Connecticut State University, the current *ISTR* editor, is presently working to include parliamentary debate results as well.

The *ISTR* includes statistics for every recorded tournament on the top three speakers in each individual event and the top three debate teams in each division. Extensive statistical analysis precedes the actual results in a separate introductory section, including summaries of types of sweepstakes offered, event frequency, and tournament size. Perhaps the most interesting statistics are the results of the National Sweepstakes, a compilation of a full year's worth of results into a ranking for an entire year of competition.

In the 1989 edition *of ISTR,* guest contributor J.G. Harrington provides statistics on "the One Hundred Trophy Club," a listing of those competitors who have garnered 100 or more forensics awards during their college competitions. The table appearing in *ISTR* is drawn from a larger electronic database, which includes for each individual a bare minimum of name, school, last year of competition, and number of awards won. In some cases, the database also includes information about individual awards won.

The publication of *ISTR* was suspended for several years in the mid- 1980's and only one complete set of all the published books, owned by the current editor, is known to exist. To improve this situation, Dr. Edward Harris of Suffolk University is currently investigating the preservation of all volumes of *ISTR* on microform. Having a second set of *ISTR* archived would better guarantee the preservation of this research tool.

It is likely that the above listing only covers a small portion of the resources kept by individuals and organizations. Since so many are informal personal or school records, it may never be possible to discover all of them. Nevertheless, the resources described here could serve as a worthwhile starting point for discovery of even more esoteric sources as research progresses.

At the same time, there are a few steps individuals in the forensics community can take to improve the storage and retrieval of forensics information. The most obvious would be to pursue a full-fledged catalog of all forensics records in existence. While this position paper has merely listed the options in general terms, a complete catalog could itemize each individual and institution's holding. Such a project would

---

[7]*Intercollegiate Speech Tournament Results*, edited and published by Dr. Seth C. Hawkins, Southern Connecticut State University, New Haven, CT.

be very labor intensive since it would involve attempting to survey every forensics program in the nation (as well as alumni and former coaches), but the success of *ISTR* and Sharon Porter's (Northern Arizona University) recently published forensics directory[8] indicates that a project of this magnitude is feasible.

Short of completing such a massive project, it would be helpful if the forensics community would strive to produce more thorough records of its activities. Specifically, tournament directors need to submit their results to ISTR in the most accurate, complete, and timely manner possible. Inclusion of tournament results in this record should receive the same priority as submission of results for documenting students' eligibility for national tournaments.

Finally, errors made by those outside the forensics community need to be pointed out vigorously. I have already written to R.R. Bowker, the publishers of *Ulrich's International Periodicals Directory*, alerting them that as a member of the forensics community and as a professional librarian, I disagree with their miscategorization of the *National Forensic Journal.* Other individuals need to lobby as forcefully as possible for accurate representation of forensics literature in the standard reference material.

The immediate situation for forensics research is not about to change dramatically. It will take several years even in the best circumstances to make forensics literature as accessible as the literature of more established fields. Fortunately, however, enough informal networks for information distribution have emerged to fill the gap until research access improves.

---

[8]1989-90 Collegiate Forensics Directory, edited and published for the Council of Forensics Organizations by Sharon Porter, Northern Arizona University, Flagstaff, AZ.

THE VALUE OF FORENSICS RESEARCH: THE DIRECTOR OF FORENSICS' VIEW

*Roger C. Aden**

Identifying the value of forensics research, whether from the perspective of a director of forensics or a university administrator, is difficult because of the uncertainty we have over why we do forensics research. Unfortunately, the skeptical, and perhaps prevailing, view is that we do it mainly for job security. "As a new generation of directors seeks jobs and tenure, they take advantage of the opportunity to publish articles that establish the norms for the events," writes Murphy ("Separate" 117). Ironically, Murphy's comments are found in an article suggesting how we can improve forensics. Thus, the confusion: is forensics research generated to improve the activity or to improve the job security of its sponsors? Although the dichotomy I establish is somewhat forced—job security and a desire to improve forensics are not mutually exclusive goals—I offer it to draw attention to the fact that we can overlook a valuable resource for our students and our activity if we think of research articles in forensics as merely tools to gain tenure. Accordingly, in the following paragraphs I attempt to highlight the means by which forensics research can strengthen programs, and by extension, the community.

First, forensics research assists coaches by offering perspectives for approaching the various events. Most of us, if we are so fortunate, completed only one class that concerned issues involved with directing a forensics program. Given the limited time available for such a course and the myriad of issues to discuss, we likely learned much of our profession through trial-and-error as graduate students. Consequently, our ideas of what and how to teach our students are picked up from our mentors and what we see succeeding at tournaments.

Forensics research, fortunately, provides is with additional perspectives for coaching—many of them offered by opinion leaders in the forensics community. The *National Forensic Journal*, for example, is filled with articles outlining methods to approach the coaching of various individual events. Reynolds and Fay discuss the interaction of the classical canons of invention and memory in impromptu speaking; Dreibelis and Redmon explore means of presenting a serious theme throughout an after dinner speech; Swarts explains the function of the introduction in oral interpretation events while VerLinden encourages

**National Forensic Journal*, VIII (Spring, 1990), 57-60.

ROGER C. ADEN is an Assistant Professor and Director of Forensics in the Department of Communication & Theatre Arts at University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire, Eau Claire, WI 54702.

critical decision-making in the compilation of an oral interpretation event; Aden and Kay as well as Crawford suggest an approach to improving the educational value of extemporaneous speaking.

Perhaps the most helpful role of forensics research involves probably the least understood and most debated event, rhetorical criticism. Most scholars agree that composing a "professional," thorough rhetorical criticism that is under ten minutes when presented orally is next to impossible. As a result, substantial confusion arises when we seek to tell our own students and other students (through ballots) what constitutes an effective criticism. While there is certainly no universal standard of quality criticism, several articles exist that illuminate components of a solid rhetorical criticism speech (Benoit and Dean; Dean; German; Kay and Aden; Murphy, "Theory"; Rosenthal). These and other articles provide a plentiful harvest of ideas to consider when coaching rhetorical criticism.

Second, forensics research provides a valuable resource for students. The cost of a subscription to each of the major forensic journals is minimal and gives students access to the judging philosophies of some of the community's opinion leaders—philosophies that students will not find on the brief, context-specific ballots they receive at tournaments. In addition to the approaches to the various events (noted in the previous point), students can learn about the evolution of events like oratory (Sellnow and Ziegelmueller) to discover what is "cutting edge" in the activity, explore the advantages and disadvantages of using original material in oral interpretation (Endres; Green; Lewis), and how to properly use evidence in a speech—a skill we frequently take for granted since Frank notes the widespread improper use of evidence in a national final round of persuasive speaking.

The availability of these resources is especially important for those programs working without a full-time director of forensics. Additionally, directors can direct advanced students' knowledge of why they are creating performances in a particular manner. Since most all of our current directors of forensics were at one time undergraduate competitors, we are well-served to encourage the understanding of forensics pedagogy and scholarship at the undergraduate level.

Third, forensics research enhances student and coach understanding of the connection between theory and practice. Although some articles in individual events research ground themselves in and/or develop communication theory, the primary beneficiaries of theory-based research are students who participate in debate. A recent issue of *Argumentation and Advocacy,* for example, devoted itself to presenting various perspectives on counterplans (Herbeck et al.; Panetta and Dolley; Perkins; Solt; Walker). In a similar vein, Gass critiqued the

growing use of the narrative perspective in academic debate. Topicality articles are also a source of theory/practice ideas for students participating in debate (Shepard). Finally, Allen and Kellerman studied whether disadvantages taught how to argue but not how to persuade.

The preponderance of theory/practice research in debate is, of course, partially a function of the historical, interactive, and argumentative nature of the activity. Still, individuals engaged in individual events research would do well to enhance the quality and quantity of such research in their realm. While projects that suggest what is effective can offer theoretically valuable insights, the focus of much of the research is still on effectiveness—"this is what we should be doing." In other words, much individual events research tells coaches and students how to fit in with the status quo instead of questioning the practices produced by the status quo. Part of the blame lies in the "inbreeding" that occurs among the most successful programs in the country. As Murphy notes, many of the coaches of the most successful programs earned their degrees at other successful programs ("Separate" 116). Second, the competitive nature of the activity tends to promote practices that are successful. The after dinner speech that is without a first point of definition, for example, is rare. Certainly, inbreeding and desire for success may in fact be generating practices that are theoretically sound but perpetuating those practices without increased self-reflection may prevent improvement of the activity.

Forensics research can and should be more than a means to attain job security. There is certainly no use in denying that any individual is not better off without a record of research, forensics or otherwise. Yet, those of us who have chosen forensics as a profession possess a special obligation, I believe, to produce research that enhances the practice of communication. More than any other interest group in our discipline, forensics concerns itself with the use of communication in public. Accordingly, our efforts should focus on what can be done to enhance the communication education our students receive in forensics. And, as directors of forensics, we should do our best to see that our students are exposed to the ideas of ourselves and our colleagues.

Works Cited

Aden, Roger C. and Kack Kay. "Improving the Educational Value of Extemporaneous Speaking: Refocusing the Question." *National Forensic Journal* 6 (1988): 43-50.

Allen, Mike and Kathy Kellermann. "Using the Subjective Probability Model to Evaluate Academic Debate Arguments." *Argumentation and Advocacy* 25 (1988): 93-107.

Benoit, William L. and Kevin W. Dean. "Rhetorical Criticism of Literary Artifacts." *National Forensic Journal* 3 (1985): 154-162.

Crawford, John E. "Toward Standardized Extemporaneous Speech Competition: Tournament Design and Speech Training." *National Forensic Journal* 2 (1984): 41-55.

Dean, Kevin W. "Coaching Contest Rhetorical Criticism." *National Forensic Journal* 3 (1985): 116-127.

Dreibelbis, Gary C. and Kent R. Redmon. "But Seriously Folks. . .Considerations for Writing the Competitive After Dinner Speech." *National Forensic Journal* 5 (1987): 95-103.

Endres, Thomas G. "Maintaining Integrity in Forensics Interpretation: Arguments Against Original Literature." *National Forensic Journal* 6 (1988): 103-111.

Frank, Robert L. "The Abuse of Evidence in Persuasive Speaking." *National Forensic Journal* 1 (1983): 97-107.

Gass, Robert H., Jr. "The Narrative Perspective in Academic Debate: A Critique." *Argumentation and Advocacy* 25 (1988): 78-92.

German, Kathleen M. "Finding a Methodology for Rhetorical Criticism." *National Forensic Journal* 3 (1985): 86-101.

Green, Keith D. "Original Material in Forensic Oral Interpretation: A Violation of Integrity." *National Forensic Journal* 6 (1988): 69-72.

Herbeck, Dale A., John P. Katsulas, and Karla K. Leeper. "The Locus of Debate Controversy Re-Examined: Implications for Counterplan Theory." *Argumentation and Advocacy* 25 (1989): 150-164.

Kay, Jack and Roger C. Aden. "Clarifying Tournament Rhetorical Criticism: A Proposal for New Rules and Standards." *National Fonnsic Journal* 7 (1989): 29-41.

Lewis, Tbdd V. "The Performance of Literature at Forensics Tournaments: A Case for the Use of Original Material." *National Forensic Journal* 6 (1988): 63-67.

Murphy, John. "Separate and Unequal: Women in the Public Address Events." *National Forensic Journal* 7 (1989): 115-125.

Murphy, John. "Theory and Practice in Communication Analysis." *National Forensic Journal* 6 (1988): 1-11.

Panetta, Edward M. and Steven Dolley. "The Topical Counterplan: A Competitive Policy Alternative." *Argumentation and Advocacy* 25 (1989): 165-177.

Perkins, Dallas. "Counterplans and Paradigms. *"Argumentation and Advocacy* 25 (1989): 140-149.

Reynolds, Christina L. "'Winning' Orations? A Study of Select Interstate Oratorical Speeches." *National Forensic Journal* 1 (1983): 119-135.

Reynolds, Christina L. and Mitchell Fay. "Competitive Impromptu Speaking." *National Forensic Journal* 5 (1987): 81-94.

Rosenthal, Robert E. "Changing Perspectives on Rhetorical Criticism as an Event." *National Forensic Journal* 3 (1985): 128-138.

Sellnow, Timothy L. and George Ziegelmueller. "The Persuasive Speaking Contest: An Analysis of Twenty Years of Change." *National Forensic Journal* 6 (1988): 75-85.

Shepard, David W. "Burden of What?" *Journal of the American Forensic Association* 9 (1973): 361-363.

Solt, Roger. "Negative Fiat: Resolving the Ambiguities of Should." *Argumentation and Advocacy* 25 (1989): 121-139.

Swarts, Valerie R. "The Function of the Introduction in Competitive Oral Interpretation." *National Forensic Journal* 6 (1988): 35-41.

Verlinden, Jay G. "The Metacritical Model for Judging Interpretation." *National Forensic Journal* 5 (1987): 57-66.

Walker, George B. "The Counterplan as Argument in Non-Policy Debate." *Argumentation and Advocacy* 25 (1989): 178-191.

RESEARCH AND SCHOLARSHIP IN FORENSICS AS VIEWED BY AN ADMINISTRATOR AND FORMER COACH

*Jack Kay**

"So, you want some advice on achieving tenure? First and foremost, make sure you develop a *real* research program. Don't spend your time doing that 'fluff stuff' that appears in forensic journals and at all those debate and forensic panels at conventions. The 'fluff' counts as service—no tenure and promotion committee in their right mind would consider as scholarship articles on such things as judge ratings at the NFA and AFA tournaments. Tenure will be based on doing real research." These words, uttered by a department chair to a young assistant professor who occupied the position of director of forensics, reflect an unfortunately pervasive attack on forensic-related research. At many institutions across our country and in many circles within our discipline's professional associations, forensic directors are regarded as second-class citizens and forensic-related research is perceived as less than a scholarly endeavor.

My aim in this article is not to join the apparently growing number of former forensic directors who have moved on to administrative positions and become forensic antagonists. Neither is my aim to become the apologist who attempts to rebut the charge that forensic-related research is not true scholarship. Rather, my purpose is to plead with members of the forensic community to ground their research interests in matters which simultaneously serve the community of forensics and the community of scholars who are dedicated to the understanding of human communication.

The major impetus for my pleading is what I term a "crisis of self-contentment" that seems to be pervading the various forensic communities. A brief historical digression is needed to make the point.

In the early days of forensic activities—the literary and debating societies of the 1800s and early 1900s—forensics was a goal-directed rather than process-directed endeavor. Students joined the societies because they found in them a place to practice argumentation, public speaking, parliamentary procedure, and literary interpretation. Students viewed the literary and debating society as a laboratory for learning the skills and practices they perceived to be vital to success in public life. Rules and procedures varied within and between the many literary

**National Forensic Journal*, VIII (Spring, 1990), pp. 61-68.
JACK KAY is Chair and Associate Professor, Dept. of Speech Communication University of Nebraska, Lincoln, NE 68588.

and debating societies that flourished in large cities and small towns throughout the United States. Experimentation and flexibility, not codified rules and stylized formats, epitomized the conduct of forensic activity in the literary and debating societies.[1]

Today, students join forensic activities for many of the same reasons as did their counterparts of the 1800s and early 1900s. The activity students enter today, however, is considerably different. Today's students enter one of many forensic fiefdoms—CEDA, NDT, NFA-IE, AFA-IE, ADA, national circuit IE, regional circuit IE and so on. Each fiefdom is marked by highly stylized rules of procedure and definitions of success. Often, the commitment to the practices within each fiefdom (each fiefdom views their own practices as superior to the practices of the other fiefdoms) overshadows the commitment to goal (forensics as a laboratory for the practice and understanding of human communication).

This brief historical digression highlights the crisis of self-contentment which I believe stifles meaningful scholarship in forensics. The self-contentment, combined with the competitive urge in each of us to prove that our own fiefdom is superior to everyone else's fiefdoms, promotes forensic research which is self-serving rather than community-serving. Our forensic journals thus abound with articles that focus on such matters as tournament practices, scoring systems, ballot design, and event rules - all written from the perspective of the relationship between the pristine forensic laboratory and the works which that laboratory attempts to simulate.

The crisis of self-contentment manifests itself in several ways. One of the most visible manifestations is the growing isolation of the forensic activity. Consider, for example, how infrequently research articles on forensics appear in the major refereed journals of our field. Consider further the infrequency of significant public attention (or discipline attention for that matter) to the activity in which we engage.

Another manifestation of our self-contentment is our failure to notice and take seriously the criticisms of our activity. I was shocked when my former college dean (a chemist who was well-versed in the importance of the laboratory) returned from a national conference of college deans and asked me to stop by his office. My dean informed me that in his conversations with other deans the subject of forensics was addressed. He proceeded with a diatribe of concerns about the sterility of the activity, the highly stylized rules that bear no resemblance to

[1]David Potter, *Debating in the Colonial Chartered Colleges: An Historical Survey, 1642 to 1900,* (New York: Teachers College, Columbia U., 1944); Jack Kay, "Literary Societies and Debating Clubs of Southern Illinois University, 1874-1941", M.S. Thesis, Southern Illinois U. at Carbondale, 1975.

real-world communication practices, the egotistical involvement of coaches, the abandonment of traditional rhetorical principles, and so forth. I immediately concluded that he was speaking about NDT-style debate. "Oh no," he said, "the concerns aren't about NDT. The deans were talking about individual speaking events and CEDA."

The most dangerous manifestation of our self-contentment is, I fear, that we have become so comfortable with our current rules and practices that we have lost sight of the fundamental goal upon which our activity is based - providing a laboratory in which students learn about human communication through experimentation and critique. Something is clearly wrong when the big disputes at our national policy-making meetings involve such items as whether or not to allow judge questioning in rhetorical criticism, to adopt a 9-3-6 debate format instead of a 10-3-5 format, to allow two or three teams per school at the National Debate Tournament, and to ban dancing in oral interpretation performances.

My plea is for our forensic communities (the plural is intentional) to transcend the lure of individual fiefdoms and rededicate itself (the singular is intentional) to viewing and designing the forensic activity as a laboratory. Such rededication would enhance the value of the activity for students and would better serve the communication discipline, the academic community, and the community of responsible citizens.

The vision of forensics as a laboratory is certainly not new. During and after the Sedalia Conference, the first national developmental conference on forensics, the notion of forensics as a laboratory took on considerable popularity. Sedalia conferees, in a definitional statement, noted that forensic activities "are laboratories for helping students to understand and communicate various forms of argument more effectively in a variety of contexts with a variety of audiences." The term "laboratory" is variously defined. Bartanen, for example, tells us that a laboratory is "a place for experiment, where theories and ideas are critically tested and ultimately validated, modified or discarded."[2] Thomas draws upon Sedalia and interprets the laboratory as potentially fulfilling several goals: "(1) The laboratory may be a *production workshop* where something is made or analyzed as a public service. (2) The laboratory may be a *teaching and learning environment.* (3) The laboratory can be *the setting for controlled scientific research."*[2]

[2]Michael D. Bartanen, 'Are New Events Needed to Enhance a Laboratory Experience in Argumentation?" in *Dimensions of Argument: Proceedings of the Second Summer Conference on Argumentation* (hereafter, *Dimensions),* eds. George Ziegelmueller and Jack Rhodes (Annandale, VA: SCA, 1981) 405.

[3]David A. Thomas, "Sedalia Plus Five: Forensics as a Laboratory," in *Proceedings of the Summer Conference on Argumentation* (hereafter, *Proceedings),* eds. Jack Rhodes and Sara Newell (Annandale, VA: SCA/AFA, 1980) 246-48.

Applying these definitions to competitive forensics is certainly laudable. However, there is good reason to believe that the laboratory notion is often seen as only incidental to competitive forensics. Competitors and judges alike are usually more interested in the activity of forensics than the object of that activity. Zarefsky makes the point clear:

> The distinction between 'forensics' and 'forensic activities' is not trivial. Rather, the first stands to the second as genus to species. But people in forensics, by and large, identify themselves with the species rather than the genus. They define their professional roles by reference to activity programs rather than to the object of their study.[4]

The forensic laboratory must have at its apex the pedagogical function. As Ziegelmueller summarizes in the proceedings of the Sedalia conference: the *raison'd'etre* of forensics is pedagogy.[5] Thus, a critical function of the forensic laboratory is pedagogical; the laboratory must teach students about communication and argumentation.[6] The laboratory should acquaint students with a variety of perspectives on communication and argument, provide a forum for testing those perspectives, and provide knowledge transferable to the genus (the real world of communication and argumentation) when the participants are removed from the laboratory.

In addition to this pedagogical function, the forensic laboratory should also "create" knowledge. The laboratory of the physical sciences is an appropriate analogy. Here students perform experiments to learn about various physical science principles. After gaining rudimentary skills, students continue to experiment in an effort to discover new principles—principles which may later be transferred to the real world. The forensic laboratory may create knowledge in several areas: knowledge about communication and argumentation strategies, knowledge about specific fields of communication and argument, and knowledge about argumentation theory. Several writers have argued that such knowledge creation can be achieved by academic debate. Goodnight, for example, claims:

> Whether in the area of argument fields, value disputation, social analysis, or political assessment, development of debate theory has much to offer students of argumentation. Beyond that knowledge which can be provided by philosophical speculation or in the field of research among naive social actors, debate offers a challenge to those who construct theories of arguments to test those theories through an impartial and intense encounter of advocates. As

---

[4]David Zarefsky, "Argumentative and Forensics," in *Proceedings*, 22.

[5]George W. Ziegelmueller, cited in McBath, 18.

[6]I subscribe to the position adopted at the first National Development Conference on Forensics that forensics, both debate and individual events, is rooted in the argumentative perspective. See McBath.

> practices of argument in debate continue to evolve, there is much worth that can be shared with those who would study argumentation.[7]

There appears to be no inherent reason why the individual events laboratory cannot offer this intense interaction in the testing of theory.

Do forensic events, as currently practiced, provide an effective laboratory for argument? Unfortunately, the answer is no. Two indictments establish this claim. First, most forensic events lack a theoretical base. Although over the years forensic educators have liberally borrowed from persuasion research, psychology, and other fields, they have been relatively unconcerned with a "theory of argument." This point is raised throughout forensic literature. Bartanen, for example, argues:

> Even more significant to the confusion about the role of individual events in argumentation is the absence of theoretical discussion about individual events and arguments. Recent years have found numerous studies of the relationship between debate and decision making, as well as the implementation of many decision making concepts into the actual practice of academic debate. No similar relationship exists between individual events and decision making.[9]

Larson and O'Rourke issue a similar claim:

> Even though there has been an increase in the number and frequency of individual events offerings at forensic tournaments the literature on the use of argumentation in individual events is almost nil. Coaches and forensic experts have not taken the time to think out the argumentation dimensions related to individual events they have in the field of debate.[8]

The notion that our pedagogy must be grounded in theory, or as Faules, Rieke, and Rhodes state, "pedagogy is generated by theory," is not a controversial one.[10] When practice exists independent of theory—or, only loosely connected to that theory—the laboratory cannot be judged adequate. In addition to the missing theoretical grounding, the current practice of forensic events also demonstrates its inadequacy as a laboratory for argument. The overall point is supported by Bartanen:

> Equally as important are some of the actual practices of individual events which detract from the ability of individual events to successfully teach argumentation. Henry McGucken, for example, criticizes the performance and analytical weaknesses of the individual events: "Extemp and impromptu frequently seem to stress the glib over the thoughtful, interp to stress the actor's finesse over the literary insight, and oratory may be the saddest event of all, for that event possesses the greatest potential for exercising reasoned eloquence. Instead, tournament oratory has given rise to a specialized form of discourse, a

---

[7]G, Thomas Goodnight, "The Re-union of Agrumentation and Debate Theory," in *Dimensions,* 428.

[8]Bartanen, 408.

[9]Suzanne Larson and Sean Patrick O'Rourke, "Predominant Forms of Argument in Individual Events," in *Dimensions,* 325.

[10]Don F. Faules, Richard D. Rieke, and Jack Rhodes, *Directing Forensics: Context and Debate Speaking* (Denver: Morton, 1978) 1-31.

> 'third sophistic' plumbing the affective depths of style and delivery, poor rhetoric and worse poetry, a kind of speech presently unheard and unheard of anywhere except in oratory contests.[11]

Although many factors contribute to the poor practice of argumentation in forensics, three factors stand out. First, with a few exceptions, most forensic events do not bear much resemblance to the practical discourse situations students will face when they leave the contest environment. In their study of argument forms in individual events, Larson and O'Rourke conclude:

> There needs to be a stronger connection between forensic contest speeches and the actual public speaking situations students are likely to experience in real-life. In real-life a speaker seldom draws a national topic, outlines a speech, and then delivers the speech 30 minutes later. It is also highly unlikely that a speaker will memorize a persuasive speech on a serious social problem and propose a means of correcting the evil—all within a ten minute time limit.[12]

Without this "real-life" link the forensic laboratory is too artificial.

A second factor contributing to the poor practice of forensic events is the failure of the tournament model to incorporate intense interaction. The typical tournament involves events for which students enter a room in which sits a single judge. Students perform their event and then leave. Very rarely do students have the opportunity to challenge the ideas presented by other speakers. Aside from a single sheet of paper or a notecard the judge has little opportunity to interact with the student. The absence of interaction and the lack of intense challenging of ideas further divorces forensic events from practical discourse.

The third factor contributing to poor forensic practice is both situational and theoretical. This factor involves the nature of the audience which the forensic student addresses. The nature of the audience in academic debate has undergone significant change - ranging from the general lay audience to the more specialized hypothesis tester and public policy maker. The nature of the audience in individual events is less clear. In some ways the individual events audience resembles the "universal audience" identified by Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca.[13] The vagueness of this concept, especially as applied to ten different individual speaking events, makes it difficult for judges and students alike to understand how argumentation should best occur. If we buy into the conclusions generated by argument fields research—that different fields involve different argument standards—then the universal

[11]Bartanen, p. 408; citing Henry McGucken, "Forensic in the Liberal Education," *Western Speech* 34 (1970): 137.

[12]Larson and O'Rourke, 334.

[13]C. Perelman and L. Olbrechts-Tyteca, *The New Rhetoric: A Treatise on Argumentation*, trans. John Wilkinson and Purcell Weaver (Notre Dame: U. Notre Dame Press, 1969).

audience concept is inadequate and fails to contribute to a sound pedagogical experience.

I have argued in other works that the forensic activity should model its events upon real-world communication practices.[14] The analogue approach to individual events and debate is presented as a means to improve the laboratory experience available to students as well as to provide a more realistic environment in which theory can be tested and social action can be critiqued.

Adapting competitive forensics to a laboratory which attempts to model either everyday discourse situations or specialized discourse contexts would do a great deal to enhance the pedagogical worth of forensic participation by giving students a more realistic speaking situation. By more closely resembling natural discourse situations, competitive forensics would allow students to utilize the results of scholarly research on persuasion and communication in their efforts to prepare for forensic competition. By mirroring the audience and interaction demands of natural discourse, students would learn a great deal more about the argumentation and communication process. In addition, viewing forensics as a laboratory for argument provides researchers with another forum in which to test theory.

The analogue approach is an important step in advancing forensic scholarship. The approach allows us to focus on questions of extrinsic value rather than intrinsic value. Questions such as "what is the relationship between judge geography and scoring at the NFA tournament?" would be replaced with questions such as, "What is the relationship between successful performance in the forensic laboratory and successful speaker performance in the business world?"

I certainly do not envision rapid embracement of the analogue approach. After all, most of us are content with the fiefdoms that have been established. Thus, I offer a more modest proposal. When we engage in forensic research we should constantly ask ourselves, "What is the importance of the question that I am asking?" The starting point for assessing the quality of research in any discipline is the insightfulness of the questions being asked. Tucker, Weaver, and Berryman-Fink write: "One of the most damning observations on a research study is contained in the words *So what?* or *Who cares?* Its implication is that the

---

[14]See, for example, Jack Kay, "Rapprochement of World 1 and World 2: Discovering the Ties Between Practical Discourse and Forensics," *in Argument in Transition: Proceedings of the Third Summer Conference on Argumentation,* eds. David Zarefsky, Malcolm O. Sillars, and Jack Rhodes (Annandale, VA: SCA/AFA. 1983) 927-37; Jack Kay, "Individual Events as a Laboratory for Argument: Analogues for Limited Preparation Events," paper presented at the annual meeting of the Central States Speech Association, 14 April 1984.

research is trite and unrelated to anything important."[15] If our question serves only a small, isolated fiefdom, we are engaged in service. If our question advances knowledge about human communication, we are engaged in scholarship.

References

[1]James McBath, *ed.*,*Forensics as Communication: The Argumentative Perspective* (Skokie, IL: National Textbook, 1975).

[15]Raymond K. Tucker, Richard L. Weaver II, and Cynthia Berryman-Fink, *Research in Speech Communication* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1981) 217.

ON PUBLISHING AND PERISHING: SOME APPROACHES IN FORENSIC RESEARCH

*Donn W. Parson**

One of the major concerns facing the participants of the first national conference on forensics—the Sedalia Conference—some twenty-five years ago was nature and production of research. Beginning with the observation, "If forensics is to improve its status with colleagues and in other disciplines, it will be through heightened emphasis on research and scholarship" (Forensics as Communication, 34), the conference went on to articulate goals and methods for enhancing research in forensics. Such recommendations included recognizing the diversity of methods possible in forensic research; increasing the dissemination of forensic scholarship; having professional organizations sponsor and support forensic research; and focusing on the characteristics of those engaged in forensics. The conference clearly created a call to research in forensics (Forensics as Communication, 37-40).

That was in 1974. The Sedalia Conference also recommended a follow-up conference to reassess these recommendations and their implementation. The Northwestern Conference, held in 1984, did not, however, assess *per se* the recommendations of Sedalia concerning research. It did consider research in formulating promotion and tenure standards that were most appropriate to forensic educators. There was very little effort by this conference to change the definition or nature of research that should be evaluated. Instead, they argued for a quality rather than a quantity standard for evaluating research.

> Forensics educators should satisfy each standard at the same level of QUALITY expected of their colleagues; the AMOUNT of teaching, scholarship, and service, however, may distinguish forensic educators from their colleagues. Because of the nature of their assignment, forensic educators will SHOW MORE in some categories and less in others. Evaluations, therefore, should be the result not of counting but of WEIGHING their quality. Moreover, the CRITERIA for determining whether standards are met will distinguish forensics educators form their colleagues, because of the nontraditional circumstances in which forensic educators engage in teaching, scholarship, and service (American Forensics in Perspective, 25-26; emphasis in original).

Forensic educators have long been familiar with "nontraditional circumstances." These have included a seven day work week when weekend travel is added to a normal teaching week; long hours of travel often by the oldest and least comfortable university van available; a budget which reduces food choices to a comparison between

**National Forensic Journal*, VIII (Spring 1990), 69-72.

DONN W. PARSON is a Professor and Director of Graduate Studies in the Department of Communication Studies, University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS.

McDonalds and Wendy's; and an education in contemporary music guaranteed to produce hearing loss. The forensic educator does, indeed, experience "non-traditional circumstances," quite different from his or her colleague, such as a professor of physics who now has the task of evaluating the forensic director for tenure.

Without belaboring the obvious, it should not be surprising that the "non-traditional circumstances" result in a rapid turnover of debate and individual events coaches, a decrease in the number of forensic educators being prepared in our graduate schools, and increased difficulty in gaining promotion and tenure for the forensic director. In fact, in some colleges and universities, the coach is employed in an "administrative position," not subject to the normal evaluation of educators, but subject to the evaluation of a single individual, usually a dean, and without any meaningful procedural safeguards. The hiring of debate coaches as "non-faculty" hardly increases the attractiveness of forensic education, nor does it enhance the longevity of forensic careers.

However, the dominant criterion for evaluation of faculty will continue to remain the category of research. While promotion and tenure committees will often be ambiguous in specifying the relative weights of teaching, research, and service, estimates of the weight of research have been as high as 65%. So while the forensic educator seeking promotion and tenure may argue for a different weighting of factors due to the "non-traditional circumstances" of his or her position, the approach taken to research will likely remain the key to success.

It may well be that the "non-traditional circumstances" will also result in some "non-traditional" research. Promotion and tenure committees have little difficulty in understanding and evaluating articles in standard form, refereed by peers, and published in leading national journals. The field of forensics should pay special attention to guaranteeing a forum for such research. Increasing the available forums, such as the creation of this very journal, should be of help in that regard.

Forensic coaches are by nature critics. In fact, because of their training, aptitude and regular activity, they engage in more criticism than almost any faculty member. However, most of the criticism is cryptic and even more is oral. By cryptic, I mean that a complex set of reasons for judgment is truncated into a written ballot, usually under the pressure of time. Oral criticisms, when time permits, have all the advantages of immediacy and none of the advantages of permanence. Hence the criticism in which a coach engages is either cryptic or ephemeral. Neither characteristic particularly impresses promotion and tenure committees.

While refereed articles will be of more help to the promotion file, there are other opportunities to engage in research. In broadening the

definition of research, the recommendations of the Northwestern Conference on Forensics include:

6. Development or criticism of argument in the public forum, such as political debate, governmental affairs, and economic and social issues.
7. Creative or artistic productions. (American Forensics in Perspective, 29).

The recommendations of the Sedalia Conference on research seem to assume that all research will be in forensics. Clearly this need not be the case. If it is accurate to assume that all forensic coaches will have some training in criticism, the methods employed can extend to any number of areas. Any public discourse, for example a governmental action with its accompanying rhetoric, becomes available for the forensic educator's scrutiny. Arguments from the national debate topic of a given year can make excellent examples of available discourse for critical analysis. It may be that the most common method becomes argumentative criticism, but that surely is one area where the forensic coach's talents excel.

After twenty-four years of directing a large and active debate program, I retired to a much "softer" job: directing a large and active graduate program. Those twenty-four years demonstrated with clarity to me several generalizations (known mystically as "Jayhawk truths"). First, I would argue that no undergraduate works harder or engages in more research than the active debater; and second, I would argue that no graduate student seeking a degree works harder than those also coaching debate. Unfortunately, this effort of debaters and coaches is not often recognized and less often appropriately rewarded.

As a director of graduate study, I have become concerned with the relationship of forensics to the graduate programs in America. In 1974, the Sedalia Conference made the following recommendation:

> All institutions granting a doctoral degree in speech communication should have an active forensic program providing supervised instruction for future forensic educators (Forensics as Communication, 45).

This goal of 1974 seems further from enactment twenty-five years later. In an era of specialization and budget crunches, one is more likely to see institutions with doctoral programs reduce in size or scope or even eliminate the forensics program. As a field, we are turning out fewer directors of forensics than we were in 1974. (While this trend has provided an attractive "buyers market" for those few finishing the doctorate and coaching forensics, it hardly improves the health of the field.) There seem to be fewer students entering graduate school with an interest in coaching debate. Part of the reason may lie in the lack of appropriate compensation for working with forensics while in graduate

school. The reduction of one course is hardly equivalent to one's work in debate. The additional remuneration for working with debate equal to that of a departmental chair's assistant or a course grader is also inappropriate. The remuneration for a forensic assistant must be appropriate to the programmatic expectation; in most cases this means that at the outset the "extra remuneration" should be doubled. Similarly a one course reduction in a four-course load to direct forensics will hardly encourage graduates to enter the field; in most cases this means that the course reduction should be doubled.

The values of forensics as an activity are as real today as they were to those attending the 1974 Sedalia Conference. These still include a commitment to "develop students' communicative abilities, especially the abilities to analyze controversies, select and evaluate evidence, construct and refute arguments, and understand and use the values of the audience as warrants for belief" (Forensics as Communication, 16). The problem is that we have failed to heed the recommendations of the Sedalia Conference. With some attention to those ideas and ideals, there is no reason that we cannot increase interest in the activity, increase the number of graduate students interested in debate and individual events and, as a consequence, increase the number of potential directors of forensics. With greater professional commitment to the activity, there is no reason why forensics programs and their directors will not only survive in the academic world, but actually prosper.

References

McBath, J., editor (1975). *Forensics as Communication.* IL: National Textbook Company.

Parson, D., editor (1984). *American Forensics in Perspective.* Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association.

EVALUATING RESEARCH IN FORENSICS: CONSIDERATIONS OF THE TENURE AND PROMOTION PROCESS

*Raymie E. McKerrow**

This essay is written from the perspective of one who has been involved in "peer review" as both a faculty member and administrator. In discussing the value of research, the first issue is whether forensics as a field of study is itself valued. That is, whether one should do research on forensics events, or write about debate as either theory or practice, is questioned. While one might wish that such political value judgments were not a part of the process, they may be relatively or even centrally involved in some institutions at the departmental level or beyond. In those instances where there is ambivalence about doing such research, or where such research is held as suspect, a faculty member needs to make a conscious decision about what research he or she engages in. I do not want to be read as saying that a faculty member should avoid such research where the atmosphere is negative. I am of the opinion that untenured faculty should decide what they want to do in full recognition that it may not be highly valued by their own colleagues or by administrators. Life is too short to march to the drumbeat of other faculty or administrators (even though it may mean that one looks for employment elsewhere as a result of the decisions made). A controlling principle underlying the comments in this essay is that faculty should be their own person first, rather than get caught up in the "will this count?" scenario that can dominate one's professional choices. I realize that practical exigencies may make such idealism appear decidedly naive, but at least you have a sense of my own bias.

If one can get beyond the political issues, and find a situation wherein the field of study is accepted on its own merits, there is still a need to be sensitive to developing the strongest possible argument for the intrinsic importance of what one has done. Over time, the central issue that seems to dominate discussions, particularly at the College level (or whatever level one moves to in their institution that is beyond the purview of the department), is: "Is research a part of this person's lifestyle?" That is, if one is promoted, can we be fairly certain that the faculty member will continue to do research as part of his or her professional activities? After all, in promoting a person from assistant to asso-

---

* *National Forensic Journal*, VIII (Spring 1990), 73-76.

RAYMIE E. MCKERROW, is a professor in the Department of Speech Communication at the University of Maine, Orono, ME., 04469

ciate status with tenure, one presumes that a promotion to full professor is a strong probability down the road.

How does one "demonstrate" that research is a continuing part of a professional persona? The following considerations are not intended to be exhaustive, but are a representative sampling of the issues discussed in peer, chair, and dean's meetings.

First, are papers presented at regional and national conventions moved through the process toward publication? While this is not a prerequisite for every paper presented, the record should reflect a general movement toward publication, whereby convention presentations represent an initial step. Thus, at tenure time, there is a "pipeline" effect established, so that more recent presentations can be presumed to move into publication review in the future.

Second, is there evidence that the person is becoming increasingly more active in associations, either through service activity or through paper presentation and publication? While it is difficult to pin this down in quantitative terms, the general impression one hopes to convey is that increasing recognition within a field brings with it more invitations to present research or be involved professionally in some facet of the association's activities.

Third, is there a general consistency with which work is being done over time? While the number of projects in a given year will vary widely (and is heavily influenced by teaching load as well as personal factors), what one can look for is the sense that a person has not suddenly put on a major effort to get tenure. Are there major "gaps" in the work level, that are not accounted for by reasonable constraints on one's ability to be productive?

Beyond this central issue, the next major consideration is: What is this person's regional or national reputation, and how does her or his research reflect that? To a degree, this issue is responded to by asking outside evaluators to comment on the significance and value of the research. But, there are additional considerations in making the argument that what one has done is important to one's peers.

If we assume that there is a hierarchy within disciplines with respect to the relative "significance" of publishing in particular journals, an essay in *Communication Monographs* may "count" as more important than one in the *National Forensic Journal. Communication Education,* for example, is not going to publish some of the current forensic research being done, irrespective of its quality. The topic, such as a survey of tournament practices or judging styles, may be sound in terms of method, but will not necessarily by viewed as fitting within the "mission" of "Comm Ed." What needs to be made clear, especially beyond the departmental level, is that publishing in a "specialized" or

"small" journal *is* crucial to one's acceptance and reputation within a "sub-field" of the discipline. Publishing in State Association journals or in specialized forensics journals *is* appropriate because this is where the work will have the most impact. Research seeks its best audience.

Some research that is conducted, in forensics and in other areas, lends itself to collaboration and multiple authorship. Where this is the case, one needs to be concerned about the "message" conveyed with respect to individual contributions. If a dossier reveals a great deal of co-authored work, and if the person being considered is always or generally the second, third or fourth author, the case is weakened. A natural question that arises concerns what contribution a person has made, and whether that individual has initiated projects, led research, or could be published "on her or his own." In some instances, this has been dealt with in the "author notes" to an essay, where the commentary indicated the respective expertise of the authors, or that each contributed equally to the final product. This is fine at the departmental level, where there is a chance that the work will be reviewed, but is not a good strategy beyond the department. College review committees and/or Deans may not actually read your research. Three strategies are important. First, indicate in the promotion document what expertise is contributed. For example, some individuals become second or third authors in bringing methodological sophistication to the research project. That has value in its own right but needs to be clarified for the person at one or more levels above the department. Second, where several studies are done with colleagues, vary the authorship so that one person is not always second or third. Third, do independent research in addition to collaborative work.

More significant than the issue of multiple authorship, in the opinion of some reviewers, is the presence or absence of a "research program." In many cases, this reflects a bias that presumes that one sets out on a scientific quest, with a carefully designed series of studies that will, increasingly, focus attention on a subject and yield ever more useful results. Because many of our studies do not follow this pattern (or any discernible program), it may be necessary to address the issue in explicit fashion: What is there about the research done that reflects central issues, themes, or questions? If there are multiple issues or themes, how might the work be grouped? Does the work reflect a transition or change form a concentration in one area to that in a different area? For many, what is at issue is whether or how the research reflects a particular expertise. If the work represents no central theme, and seems to assume a mastery of several different research paradigms, historical epochs, or whatever, it may raise questions about how much "depth" is present. If it appears that such concerns are relevant to reviewers at the

departmental level or beyond, take whatever opportunity is afforded to address the issue (usually in a commentary on your own work). Outside reviewers may comment on issues such as coherence or centrality, but one should not leave the responsibility in their hands alone.

There are other considerations that are important in the process. For example, it is surprising that some faculty haven't the foggiest idea that they are making a "rhetorical statement" by the manner in which a document is prepared. In putting down activities in a vita, for instance, it is useful to denote which publications are "refereed," and to indicate that paper presentations are "invited" or "competitive." It also is useful to separate publications, paper presentation, book reviews, invited on-campus lectures, invited lectures at other institutions, etc. By "lumping" all these together as if they were all equal importance, one conveys a message that may be misleading. Putting events in chronological order seems obvious but is not always followed.

Thus far, I have written about the evaluation process exclusively in terms of research. Most of the issues considered are relevant to areas of research outside forensics. One issue that needs to be noted is that for coaches, the responsibilities of attending and hosting tournaments is time-consuming. That time commitment needs to be factored into any elevation of one's "research productivity." In fact, one could argue that the activity is analogous to a "performance" in the fine arts. If this is the case, a central question that many will ask is: "How is the quality of this activity to be judged or evaluated?" There are others in the forensics community far more capable than I in providing an answer to the question. The point that I wish to make is that in using a role as forensics coach as part of the tenure judgment, this issue needs to be addressed in explicit fashion.

In coming full circle to the issue of "control" over these and other professional activities, the best way to achieve tenure is to act tenured. Although this notion is not original with me, the implication it carries goes beyond making decisions that serve yourself first. What it suggests (and I realize the idealism it connotes) is that one does as an untenured person what one will do as a tenured person.

WADING INTO THE STREAM OF FORENSICS RESEARCH: THE VIEW FROM THE EDITORIAL OFFICE

*James F. Klumpp**

When Kevin Dean approached me to provide the perspective of a sitting editor for a special issue of this journal devoted to the state of research in forensics, I agreed reluctantly but out of a sense of responsibility. Over the last two decades I have served on the editorial boards of several forensics journals had I currently edit *Argumentation and Advocacy*. There is a danger in a sitting editor accepting assignments such as this: authors for whom I have had the unfortunate relationship of rejecting their work can slowly burn as they filter my criticism of past research through a lens in which they see their article exemplified in each comment, and my comments can too easily be read as prescriptions for what our journal currently seeks to publish. My response to the request comes less out of my current role, however, than out of those two decades on editorial boards. I consider a position on an editorial board as a position of trust which entails certain obligations and those obligations motivate this essay.

Editors and editorial boards carry the responsibility for bringing coherence to the body of a discipline's work. They stand between the tradition of research which defines the accumulated study of subject matter and the individual author who contributes to that study. To authors, editorial boards are viewed differently, as acceptors or rejecters of their work. To be sure, the board is charged with maintaining some sense of traditional "quality" which defines a standard of acceptability for research and leads to acceptance and rejection decisions. But such judgement is a threshold judgement and the secret of editorial work—in both senses of the term "secret"—is that the work is not really the sort of prescriptive judgement of success or failure that is characteristic of teaching and forensics coaching. Rather, as a member of an editorial board you watch submissions go by and try to assist authors in capturing the evolving ideas of the research tradition by weaving their individual submissions into a journal. You have the power to nudge authors in this or that direction a bit to locate the idea into a developing context, but it is the power to help locate ideas rather than the power to

**National Forensic Journal* VIII (Spring 1990), pp. 77-86.

JAMES F. KLUMPP is an Associate Professor in the Department of Speech Communication at the University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742. Professor Klumpp is currently editor of *Argumentation and Advocacy: The Journal of the American Forensics Association*. He has served on editorial boards for a number of forensics journals and directed programs for thirteen years.

control or initiate them. The irony of the power of the editor and the editorial board is that you are totally dependent on authors. Because there are always other journals, and because authors are a stubborn lot, the greatest power is the power to reconcile an individual effort with the coherent evolution of a tradition of research.

I accepted the invitation to write this essay, therefore, as an undocumented editorial voice, to provide a report on what has floated by in the stream of research over the last two decades. Not only will my claims be undocumented, but I have intentionally avoided citing examples so the essay can be read without an effort to identify particular essays—the reader's or someone else's. I wish to give a sense for the flow of essays rather than the distinctiveness of particular essays.

The opportunity is actually quite rare. It allows an overt expression of one voice not normally given to and editorial board member. If I succeed I will provide you just a glimpse of the difficulties in bringing coherence to these two decades, and in the process enter a dialogue more overtly and publicly than editorial boards normally do. I offer also a subtle voice of prescription, but with the guide's sense of "That's a better bet" rather than the teacher's sense of "You will be tested next week." I plan to mix comments on the places where research fails to meet publication with suggestions for successful strategies for research too little taken. In the process I will comment on styles that I see failing to reach publication, the vision of research which seems to shape the publication, and the vision of the researcher that I believe shapes those who successfully publish research in forensics.

The Style of Forensic Research

What is the difference between forensics activities and research? The question borders on the nonsensical because the differences are so obviously dramatic. But my experience is that the difficulties that forensics researchers encounter in publication often stem from inappropriately locating the relationship of the two.

Let me begin by explaining the strengths of forensics activities as I perceive them. First and foremost, forensics has maintained the central role of the personal relationship of teacher and pupil. Forensics retains the importance of prescriptive instruction in one-on-one situations. Forensics is thus an arena in which teaching is still an art based on the authority of the coach-instructor. Second, forensics has a built-in system of accountability unlike other forms of education. The tournament structure provides a short-term reward system that has many features which make it superior to mere grading systems: it is public rather than private; it is built on competition with its escalating layers of standard; it is repetitive rather than one shot and over. This system of feedback

makes it an exceedingly successful contributor to student development. The importance of competition in our society creates the tremendous power of forensics to motivate students. Finally, I believe that the stability of forensics is one of its strengths. Forensics not only has an accountability system but it has succeeded in defining that system internally. Forensics directors run forensics tournaments. Forensics judges are tightly knit into a system of evaluation and feedback which influences their assignment to rounds and their respect in the community. There are national tournaments which exert a control over any threatening deviations in tournament procedure or structure. The extent of social control provided by such an internal dynamic results in a very stable system that evolves over the years at a nearly imperceptible pace. Regardless of the cost of such a closed system, the positive result is that expectations can be more easily taught.

I mentioned the importance of understanding the relationship of these strengths to research because the most common stylistic problems which I find blocking success in publication seem to me natural accompaniments to these characteristics of forensics activities. For example, far too many essays suffer from pontification. The authority of the coach in working with the student is not the authority base which a healthy system of research relies upon. Rather the system of authority based in the concept of "peer" review assumes a more democratic authority structure. Most review of research is blind review which deprivileges the hierarchical authority which characterizes forensics instruction. As a result, carrying the force of claims in research requires that the author imbed the claims in a rich texture of proof rather than asserted authority.

Tied closely to pontification is the use of the anecdote as proof. In forensics instruction the anecdote builds the authority of the instructor in working with students. But in the research context, where the relationship of reader to author is less personal, the anecdote is torn from the full context of personal experience and loses its power to persuade. Respect for that system means that claims are weighted by their cogency, their imbededness in the research of others, their conceptual consistency with common tasks and established viewpoints on common problems. Researchers who are able to make this transition in the pattern of expected proof succeed where others who cannot make the transition fail.

A second stylistic problem which I note frequently in forensics research is the failure to adapt oral to written style. By and large, forensics instructors are among the best presenters of ideas in convention settings. There the oral style encourages simply-focused purpose with deep illustration and extensive repetition; the author's assistance to the

listener rather than to the reader is the proper frame. The skill with which forensics instructors present papers in such settings is a tribute to their ability to fulfill the prescriptive advice that they present to students. Too often, however, when I have reviewed forensics research I find the papers presented orally submitted for review for publication without attention to adaptation—often with convention title page intact. Only for a desperate editor will such a submission strategy be successful. In fact, reviewers with whom I have discussed this problem generally concede that the lack of effort by the author to accomplish these stylistic changes probably diminishes the assistance that they provide to the author in preparing for publication. In short, the most obvious problem with such manuscripts has the least to do with the ideas presented. Time spent in converting the manuscript to written style—reducing the repetition to sound principles of written transition, amplifying intricacies of reasoning that would not be appropriate in the oral medium, converting personal references to an expected and particular audience to the more generalized audience of readers, fleshing out sections which orally may be expanded based on audience response into sections which stand on their own in the absence of such immediate feedback—is time well spent in accelerating the review of manuscripts. I believe the greatest frustration for a research referee is seeing the kernel of an excellent idea stylistically stifled. I review research for non-forensic journals as well. In general, those writing for forensics journals display the stronger command of the basic skills of proof and expression which are the first requirements of good research, but have greater difficulty in adapting work across presentational arenas. Having the pride, taking the time, and contemplating the differences among the arenas in which research is presented, will pay more dramatic dividends for authors than any other effort.

The Vision of Forensics Research

During the period that I have been reviewing forensics essays for publication three types of research have dominated the material I have received: (1) reports of descriptive survey research on attitudes and structural characteristics of forensics programs; (2) "how to" essays on particular forensics activities, usually innovative in character; and (3) theoretical essays which provide a vocabulary and structure for teaching particular forensics skills. In this section, I will describe the characteristics of the essays of each type which succeed, and then suggest a vision of forensics research that I would encourage as a potentially fruitful direction for research.

The administrative forensics survey is probably the most frequent type of submission. Not only can journal reviewers testify to this, but so

can forensics directors who are asked to complete the surveys. Typically, the surveys request and report information on budgets; participant demographics; administrative support for programs; and opinions of participants, alumni, and instructors on the power of forensics on participants' lives. The descriptive statistics employed are generally quite simple and the claims fairly straightforward. Such research reports are generally of time-bound value, since based on snapshots in time. They are also primarily useful in forensics administration. Ultimately, the test of such research is its credibility with the administrators nationwide who are the ultimate audience. The research is, however, plagued by design and instrument return problems. Few examples of such research achieve the sample structure which contribute to their strength. Often a full population mailing list is used with consequently low return. Seldom does design contain state-of-the-art methods for return. Sampling procedures are most often designed for simplicity of data collection rather than for maximum credibility of results. In general, the surveys are also designed to be rather blunt instruments for describing national forensics populations. Administrators who might try to locate their forensics programs with particular objectives or target their programs for particular students would find such overgeneralization limiting. Obviously, the most successful of these reports are those which provide the texture of credibility and the most sophistication of design. Perhaps the frequency of such research demonstrates the failing of national forensics organizations which are in the best position to commission and finance solid research of this type. My impression after reviewing this work is that many who conduct the research do not realize the difficulty which solid research of this type presents, and later find themselves submitting reports for research they know suffers problems of credibility simply because of the time they already have invested. Tragically, the time devoted to writing the report is tossing good time after bad.

The essays which describe techniques for instruction, the "how to" descriptions, come from the laudable urge to spread successful instruction as widely as possible. Certainly workshops and "trading posts" for exercises and instructional materials are an important asset to forensics instructors. Training sessions and chances to meet master teachers are particularly important for new forensics instructors. Quality research in this vein, however, should have an objective more lasting than the simple exchange of information or beginning training. The difference is most evident in the richness of appreciation for the complexity of the successful teacher-student interaction in forensics. Certainly forensics instructors are among the most successful of teachers in motivating student effort and accomplishment. Explanations for such success are rich

and interesting subjects for research. Just as certainly, these explanations will carry beyond technique into a range of characteristics of the activity and the people involved in the teacher-student relationship. Forensics instructors writing about their techniques are usually guilty of projecting the success of the technique on the technique itself. Those who have attempted to successfully use these techniques in their own classroom know the realistic assessment of the success requires much more than mere description of the technique. The successful authors of this type of research describe instruction with a degree of complexity which other submissions lack. They place their subject matter in a context of objectives and student situations which recognize the sensitivity of forensics instructors to these variations. They identify the instructional skills necessary for the technique to succeed. If they are attempting to generalize their claims about the success of the technique they employ the social scientific methods which have been developed to support such generalizations. Thus, the research achieves an analytical depth which carries it beyond anecdote.

The third type of submission is most often called the "theoretical essay." This type of research involves the development of vocabulary and posited structure for explaining phenomena and the situating of that developed theory in practice. Those interested in debate have been more successful in developing this type of research than have those interested in various individual events. Typically this research builds from the relationship between the speaking activity and its content. The elaboration of vocabulary, and strategies for its use, enables speakers in working with the content, but the impact of such theory goes beyond expanding our knowledge of the subject matter of the content. In fact, the best research of this type is well-set in two different contexts: the contextualizing knowledge of the speaker's invention and the contextualizing knowledge of the subject matter. Successful research of this type goes well beyond expressing the author's "opinion" about approaching the subject matter toward carefully developed and intricately reasoned analysis that provides strong relationships to contextualizing vocabulary and structure.

Why has debate research been more successful in generating this type of research? I believe the answer is that the restriction of debate activities to annual or semiannual topics has created the time and necessity for the depth of concentrated effort required for this type of work. The focus on questions of policy, and more recently value, and the extended periods of time working with particular topics demand insight into the potential strategies for invention. The need to elaborate the vocabulary and structure in order to elaborate argument leads to this type of development.

I believe that there are similar strategies for research, however, in all forensics events. Over the past decade there has been a renewed interest in situated argument by forensics directors or former forensics directors. This includes increasing attention to political debates, debates on such public issues as nuclear power, and other essays which examine contemporary and historically situated argument. Despite the emergence of this research in forensics journals I believe that the full power of this research for the forensics community has not been tapped. The reason is because this research and forensics issues develop independently. Yet, merging the two lines of inquiry could contribute greatly to diminishing the isolation of forensics. Forensics participants are giving speeches on real-world topics, reading the work of others in the public arena, and inventing persuasive and descriptive strategies and techniques. The value of these activities to the participant and the public multiplies, however, as the critical refinements that are a part of forensics activities are supplemented with work in the non-competitive context. Forensics instructors who conduct ongoing programs of research into the inventional strategies of those in the public arena and bring that research into their students' inventional process deepen the experience of the student.

I also believe there is an important contribution which forensics researchers can make to the understanding of this phenomena. Since I also read a large volume of material in historical/critical studies I am well aware that one of the dominant problems in this literature is the difficulty of remaining focused on the strategic rhetorical process. The temptation is to treat invention in terms of the content of the subject matter. The research in the historical/critical tradition which succeeds is research that can project the practical power of the inventional and stylistic process. Forensics instructors are involved in teaching this power to students constantly, and their sensitivity to the power yields a natural advantage. Of course, involvement by forensics instructors as consumers of public persuasion is a requisite for their jobs. But I am calling for more. I am suggesting that concentrated powers of analysis honed by careful research work with public discourse will bring the connections between forensics skills and public life more overtly to the surface of both our research and our forensics contests.

The vision I am suggesting may, in fact, return us to an earlier era when the linkages between the contest activity and the thorough understanding of non-contest contexts were more natural. Many of the memorable rhetorical critics from the speech discipline came to their power of observation from their pedagogical interest in forensics. I am not so much calling for a return to the old tradition of criticism, however, as I am for a renewal of the vision which saw inquiry into argument and

speech-making in the public arena as a necessary supplement to prepare students of forensics for their activity and the skills taught by their activity. This part of forensics education carried many of our students into public life. For the readers of our journals this research would enliven their teaching with insights into the inventional and stylistic process which would make their students better speakers. An interest in the power of the word to construct public life would renew interest in forensics as well.

Would the product of this research differ much from research now appearing? I think so. It would borrow the objective of elaborating and developing a vocabulary and structure for invention form the theoretical work in debate, but would expand the focus far beyond the narrow confines of debate. It would borrow the interests of the public arena from historical/critical work, but would provide a more vivid appreciation for the central power and responsibility of the speaker's inventional and stylistic choices in shaping the public arena. More overt expression of this vision would reopen a literature to our students which, incredibly, many do not encounter today as they learn their forensics skills.

A Vision of the Researcher

There have been many successful forensics directors who have also been successful authors of published research. Having admired these people and reviewed their work for some time, I have developed a theory about their characteristics. Above all, I believe these people manifest three abilities: the ability to integrate their experience, the ability to write regularly, and the ability to carry forensics' dedication to excellence into their research.

Integration of experience is an ability that works quite broadly to benefit the researcher. Perhaps most important is the ability to integrate their pedagogical commitment with their research commitment into a commitment to the forensics community. Forensics instructors are obviously heavily committed to teaching. Too often the relationship between teaching and research is seen as a forced choice. Although it is a cliche by now, it is a cliche in which many, including I, believe: both teaching and research are enhanced if they are integrated into a teachers' commitments. I believe this is particularly true of forensics. The instructor who sacrifices his/her research program for time in teaching must continually fight the sterilization of his/her teaching in competition. Notice the argument here is not for a "balance" between research and teaching, but an "integration." An instructor actively working with a research program develops the triangle of tension between the student performance, the competitive arena, and the public context for

the performance. The astute instructor who works through his/her mind brings fresh and insightful approaches to his/her teaching. Instructors who sacrifice their teaching to carve out separate programs of research must find separate resources for refurbishing the insights that come from analyzing the performative dimension of argumentative subject matter. The astute instructors who sharpen their analytical sense for the performative dimension in their teaching will naturally take that sense to their research work and thus improve the research work.

In addition, those who succeed as forensics scholars understand the common fabric of invention that unites their writing with their instruction in speaking. Their careful work with the written medium provides sensitivities to powers in language which integrate into their teaching forensics students. Their instructional work with students calls for a sensitivity to audience and inventional situations that carries into their writing to improve its quality.

The near-schizophrenia which many forensics directors feel between their research life and their teaching life does not characterize these models of integration. Theirs is an approach in which the best qualities of each role inform and nourish the quality in the other. Thus the integration is achieved that makes them better scholars.

The second ability which these scholars have is the ability to write regularly. They are able to carve the time from their schedule to put pen to paper. The most successful do so as a part of their daily, or at least weekly, routine. Making this room is more a matter of believing in the importance of the writing task than it is a mechanical problem. They are able to articulate to students and co-workers their commitment to an integrated approach. Of course, prior to that they are able to achieve the distance from the everyday short-term demands of their position, including the short-term demands of students, to recognize that the time spent with students is more fruitful if the instructor's inquiring mind is fine-tuned by the dedication to research. When this is accomplished, writing becomes a part of the normal routine, the guilt of time spent away from the demanding student disappears and the research program becomes a solid contribution to forensics and the instructor's forensics student.

The third ability which characterizes these scholars is their commitment to quality in their work. If there is an advantage which forensics directors have over other scholars it is their continual connection with accountability and their continual striving for excellence that is a part of their everyday activities. The sharp edge which teases quality out of hard work is never far from a forensics instructor's life. Too often, however, when research is viewed as separate from rather than integral

to their forensics experience, research becomes something that is dashed off on the plane on the way to a convention or the article that is "hammered out" over a weekend, or the convention paper that has the title page changed and mailed off for review. The result is the stylistic problems I discussed above, or worse, the substantive arguments which show the lack of advanced criticism and refinement that the same instructor would insist that his/her forensics students achieve. The successful scholars invariably carry the commitments to excellence which are the fabric of the forensics community into their work. The result is some of the best research being produced in the discipline.

I have called these "abilities" but they obviously are more likely to be developed habits of behavior than innate characteristics. Of course, some native abilities of insight and writing are necessary for success in publishing research, but these are also the marks of a good forensics instructor. Thus, the vision of the author working diligently to contribute to the body of written work in forensics is a vision in which all forensics instructors should see themselves.

Conclusion

My response to the request to provide an editor's perspective on research in forensics has been part reality and part vision. Time in the review of other people's work inevitably provides someone with this mixture. The body of forensics work is a discourse for which the community can take pride. Yet, my judgment is that generally the quality of our teaching in forensics exceeds the quality of our research; at least the breadth of teaching quality exceeds the breadth of those in the community who are contributing actively to our journals. Where ten years ago the outlets for our written work were restricted, today there are a plethora of outlets for our work. If used wisely, with both authors and editors dedicated to quality, these outlets can fill with work of the quality which reflects the quality of forensics teaching and the forensics community will be stronger and better as a result.

THE ROLE OF DEPARTMENT CHAIR AS FORENSIC PROMOTER

*Don M. Boileau**

Neil Postman claimed that often the frequency of contacts and the relationship of sender and receiver were as important a source of analysis as the content of the message. That contention provides an important principle for a department chair administering an active collegiate program in forensics—"speak frequently and positively about your forensics program to administrators throughout the university."

The three issues which will be developed in this article form my personal philosophy as a department chair in a department with an active forensics program. These issues create the substance of the messages which I am often sending about the Forensics Program at George Mason University. My own coaching was at an urban, commuter university and a rural, residential college. Also, my four years of college participation in a combined debate/individual events program merge with the administrative viewpoints I have developed from seven years as Director of Educational Services at the Speech Communication Association and three years as chair at George Mason University.

Coaching as Teaching

The oft-cited ideal of teaching as "John Hopkins at one end of the log and the student at the other" is most often realized in coaching an individual events program. This concept predominates in directing a forensics team. While most universities understand coaching in the "athletic" concept, it is imperative for the speech communication department chair to note that the coaching function is an essential ingredient of effective teaching.

While administrators and some departments perceive forensics coaching as service, a department chair needs to promote coaching as teaching—one of the best forms of teaching. Not only does it earn such a distinction by the process of constant "practice, instruction, and practice," but it also merits attention because of its integrative nature. Given the narrowness of focus of most university classes, forensics provides students with both an application of skills and a breadth of topic exposure from literature to contemporary politics. This range calls for special skills from the Director of Forensics—skills associated with the best of teaching.

**The National Forensic Journal*, VIII, (Spring, 1990), pp. 87-94.

DON M. BOILEAU, is Chair of the Communication Department at George Mason University, which houses nationally acclaimed individual events and debate programs. There are four tenure-line faculty members in the department.

The most important decision a chair makes about the Director of the Forensics program is the role developed for considerations of promotion, tenure, and retention. Since special considerations are often made for the forensics coach, this decision frames the department evaluation, the chair's evaluation, and the presentations to upper administrators. This context consists not only of time devoted to teaching, but also includes a wide range of knowledge and a variety of teaching techniques.

While many universities, i.e., Central Michigan University, view coaching as "university service," the intrinsic nature of coaching is teaching. For most faculty members the classroom and courses define the nature of teaching. The forensics coach teaches in many different locations other than the classroom—practice rooms, motel rooms, in cars/vans, and on other campuses. The forensic coach applies many methods that other educators rarely utilize. For example, most coaches use video cameras for tutorial sessions in ways that the student would not otherwise experience in the normal curriculum. Also, few teachers are skilled in integrating feedback about performances from different teachers from different universities into the instruction for a given student.

Since time pressures allow few teachers to spend tutorial time with a student on the same performance, the forensic coach has a unique opportunity to teach. When teaching a public speaking class, the instructor might give a student feedback on five to nine speeches during the semester and, under the best of conditions, office appointments with that student three or four times. Yet, the forensics coach will hear the single oration at least ten times during the season as well as integrate the comments of others.

The feedback that other coaches give provides the forensics coach with a teaching tool that few teachers can ever apply—the ability to use the skills, knowledge, and attitudes of other instructors from other universities in the teaching of one student. In the course of a single season, a student may get feedback from over twenty different instructors! How this information is used by the coach is a creative teaching decision and something that makes coaching a different type of teaching activity.

The time the coach spends with a student has two important teaching dimensions—quantity in the single season and duration over the two, three, or four years of participation. The coach creates by this time commitment a different type of teaching that is not found in other classes. While other coaches of activities, e.g., newspaper advisor, choir director, athletic coaches, have a similar time advantage, the university theorists writing about collegiate teaching do not address this important aspect of teaching undertaken by the forensics coach. Quantity of

time without quality of instruction provides only a descriptive measure. Thus, it is important to include the more significant products of this time investment—both skills and knowledge attained by the student. Good informative and persuasive speeches tend to require far more research and analysis than most "A" level term papers necessitate.

The success of the time spent often provides external measures of teaching—measures the profession rarely applies to our unique type of teaching. For me, the number of tournaments attended is an important measure of this interaction. While one-to-one comparisons of coaching forensics and teaching a class are difficult, ten, twelve, or whatever number of weekends at tournaments is a commitment to teaching that members of the academy rarely make. While to many students, and most of the public, the number of trophies won is the measure of success, the department chair needs different measures which reflect the teaching nature of coaching.

Measures of coaching as teaching not only include time and the tutorial approach, but other standards that incorporate the breadth of coaching responsibilities. For example, the selections of literature for oral interpretation events give an important viewpoint about the quality of exposure to significant literature. The intense competition of forensics means that students are constantly seeking new and challenging pieces of literature for interpretation.

The same can be said of the topics for the informative and persuasive speaking events. Extemporaneous speaking inherently develops a keen knowledge of current events; informative speaking provides its own unique challenge. For example, the traditional distinction between a topic explaining the variety of hair care topics available, and a topic explaining recent molecular discoveries in bonding as to their impact on hair care, reveals a teaching philosophy by the coach. A list of topics used by students for persuasive speeches and for informative speeches will indicate one dimension of the quality of instruction. These types of teaching decisions by the coach reveal a quality of instruction that aids the arguments of coaching as teaching.

Statements participants make about their coaches having a significant influence on their lives reflects a concern for the changes that one associates with superior teaching. Former coaches often mention how much they miss the extensive interaction with students—an opportunity to have a profound impact on their lives. My own college coach is the one professor from my undergraduate institution with whom I am still in frequent contact. This influence should be associated with superior teaching.

Forensics as a Curriculum Segment

The debate about communication competency hinges around oral performance—is oral performance as well as knowledge about theory a necessary ingredient of communication competency? While our scholars debate the issue of oral performance skills, the more important question for the chair, is whether the forensics program plays a "unique" role in the curriculum of the department? For me, the unequivocal answer is "yes." If the program were not a curriculum segment, then it could best be run like the athletic department, with separate budgets, coaches, and expectations. If it is a curriculum segment, then the unique properties of the program need to be an integral part of the curriculum.

Both critiqued practice and critiqued performance allow forensics to extend the opportunities for oral communication performance available through the department. This intensity of guided practice is not found in the regular course work. Although practice varies with the program, several examples will illustrate this unique contribution.

If a student attends five tournaments with an oration that is practiced in front of the coach two times before each tournament, the student has given the oration at a minimum ten times for practice and ten times in tournament competition. Thus, eleven different, trained people have heard that performance. If the oration is 10 minutes long, that is three and one-half hours of critiqued practice—something few courses could ever offer. The student who is competing at a national level (so that the student attends ten tournaments and makes it into semi-finals half the time, and to finals the other half the time) has fifteen more opportunities for oral performances. If three judges are used in finals, feedback jumps to thirty-five critiqued performances. If the university paid only $10 for each critique—a sum that would be impossible to obtain without the dedication of forensic coaches—the critiquing cost alone would be $350 for outside opinions for that one event. Thus, the program generates a type of teaching that the department cannot develop in its classrooms.

If the students in the example above participate at the same level in three other events then the critiquing cost of the program generates its own logic for funding. For example, the student who participates in only five tournaments has forty critiques, at a cost of $400 as well as an equivalent number for practice at a sum of $400. (Although if practice sessions are generally twice as long as a tournament situation, the real price would be doubled.) Therefore, that student receives between $800 and $1,200 worth of critiques. Also, the better students receive, using the same type of calculations (4 X 350 = 1400 + 200/400 =

1600/1800) over $1,600 in services. If there are 10 students on the team, the critiquing value alone varies from $8,000 to $16,000 for this type of calculation. If the squad has twenty students, then this minimum figure would double. This analysis is limited to the production of critiques, which is only part of the instructional goals of a good forensics program. Such analysis allows one to quantify one of the teaching functions of a forensics coach.

At George Mason University, if I hire an instructor to teach four public speaking classes, the university is paying $12,000 to generate between 440 and 800 critiques. This teaching power is at a cost of $15 a critique using the maximum number or almost $28 at the minimum number of critiques. The public speaking instructor teaches 88 students with a minimum number of speaking experiences, while the forensics program provides fewer students with extensive experience at a lesser cost per critique, but more money per student. The essential part of this analysis is that the number of experiences provided to the student is in a unique way that would not be generated in the classroom. Thus, the curricular impact stems from a method of rewarding students who are willing to put a tremendous effort into their education.

From a chair's perspective, the events and content provide an additional perspective for analyzing the forensic program. The forensic program allows the student to gain skills by participating in a spectrum of activities. Using the theoretical perspectives needed to adapt methodology in rhetorical criticism to the interpretation of a wide variety of forms of literature, the student gets an exposure to many speaking styles and formats. If one takes the SCA standards for program review at the secondary level and applies these guidelines to college forensic programs, two additional standards are met. The standard curriculum can barely touch those guidelines which state that instruction must cover a variety of audiences and a variety of speaking forms.

The person who participates all four years can easily experience a wide variety of events. Even the student who is on the squad for only one year often enters several different events. Rare is the student who is enrolled in only one event—an impossibility in most forensic programs. While critics argue that a major weakness of debate and forensic programs is the lack of real audiences (a situation remedied by some of the more creative tournaments), a department chair cannot spend too much time with students without learning how they adapt to different judges. These students study the judges' arguments, so that they know how to adapt the next time the judge hears them. Often these differences in audiences are learned by students in what to them is a most painful way—losing.

Thus, forensic programs offer a segment of instruction that the classroom does not replicate. This curriculum segment gains its uniqueness by giving the student critiques by many different listeners. This type of teaching is an inherent part of any curriculum.

The Chair as an Internal PR Voice

The chair has an important role to play that even the best forensic director does not have time or the opportunity to do. The Chair must let the administrators know about the unique contributions the activity creates. The two perspectives mentioned above are the foundations of messages which the chair must promote. First, the obligation to the coach as a faculty member is to note the potential for excellent teaching. Secondly, the program must be seen as a curricular arm of the university.

By comparing the forensics program to the music programs, one can help administrators understand the teaching and curricular contributions. Music requires faculty supervision, has both practice and performance goals, uses judges from other schools to measure quality, travels to obtain a variety of audiences, and relates all performances to the theory in the classroom. It is in terms of the faculty role that the comparison serves us best, since the teaching/coaching function for music is well understood. Administrators also understand the practice demands for musicians to achieve an acceptable level of performance.

On the one hand, the chair can serve to help with the minutia of operations from budgets to getting rooms for tournaments. But more important is the role the chair should serve to see that concern for emergency situations are covered, such as the need for having a list of all students and parents' names and addresses during a tournament, to the liability/insurance procedures of the university. The chair may coordinate the budget and annual report procedures as part of an official role.

On the other hand, the chair serves as an unofficial mouthpiece for the program explaining what the success means, how the program relates to curricular goals, and what type of community service is performed. This type of communication requires that the chair formulate a philosophy of how the program relates to the university and to the students.

My own philosophy makes a distinction between teaching by the faculty member and service by the program. The tutorial aspect of coaching is a teaching function. Hosting the local high school teachers for a meeting is a service function for both the program and the university.

It is in the latter that the chair plays the important symbolic role of representing the university. Other coaches should know that the chair/university is supporting the activity. Thus, a visible presence, when possible, at coaches meetings, workshops, tournaments, and public programs, is an important role for the chair.

Just as the high school coach needs an annual meeting with the principal before and after the season, the chair needs to meet with the coach at the college level. While topics may vary from trophy cases to the nature of coaching, these sessions help to keep communication open. From an organizational communication perspective, the chair does serve as the link between the coach and the university community, so the chair needs to ask the question, "How well am I serving as a link?" The meetings are the first step in establishing that link. Because the chair must know what is happening if effective communication with the rest of the community is developed, it is important to know what is different about each year. Questions to be discussed might include: how the university can improve its support, what curricular aspects need to be developed, what other sources of support might be used to aid the program, and what is the quality of student support from the university? These are just some of the questions which might frame such conferences. What is important is that the big questions are covered in a formal sense, so that the little problems throughout the year can be seen in their correct context.

Such meetings often provide the information to be transmitted to the deans and other officers. Few people in higher education understand the distinct properties of the forensics program, so that the chair often serves as "translator." Such a role requires a well developed philosophy. For example, a private school sees its role as serving a national constituency and therefore wants a nationwide high school tournament, while a state institution may have a greater need for reaching only the high schools in the state. In either situation, the chair needs to relate the mission of the school to the dean as to how a specific tournament functions as a recruiting tool, a service to area high schools, and/or a showcase for the university.

In those schools with graduate programs and graduate assistants helping with the forensics program, the chair, or designee, must see to it that the demands on the graduate students reflect the academic nature of the program. Like the doctors who must go through grueling schedules during residencies, graduate students working with forensics programs often give more time than their counterparts doing research or teaching duties. The chair needs to see that these students have opportunities to work directly with the students, learn about effective

coaching techniques, gain experience with administering tournaments, and develop an ethical sense of how the program ought to function.

Besides concern for service by the program, the chair must see that the students have opportunities to develop different skills. While a national champion brings an onslaught of positive publicity for the program, the chair needs to understand the varied measures of successful teaching, student experiences, and program service. These must be explained time and time again to administrators, so that a larger picture of the program can be developed. To do this the chair needs to know the important tensions that the program creates and be willing to both explain these tensions and mediate when conflict develops.

Often such a tension is between course requirements and participation in a tournament. This tension varies from professor to professor as they themselves perceive the nature of their classes and forensic competition. Frequently this is an area in which the chair can negotiate. Sometimes the tension existing for a student is the choice between participating in another tournament and learning by judging at a local high school contest. The key for the chair to resolving these tensions is knowing how to integrate the legitimate goals of the university, the student's educational goals, and the program's goals.

This essay has argued that the primary role of the chair of a speech communication department is to support the forensics program by knowing about the successes of the program and informing the administration about these successes. The key to this activity is developing a philosophy about the program which is based around the assumptions that coaching is teaching at its best and that the forensics program serves as a curricular opportunity for some students to gain experience and knowledge not available under regular classroom conditions.

FORENSICS RESEARCH: A CALL FOR ACTION

*By Sharon Porter**

In addition to the teaching and advising responsibilities expected of all college instructors, forensic coaches assume administrative and student supervisory activities not expected of their colleagues. Yet the efforts these individuals expend are not recognized or appreciated by many in the university community. Three current practices support this position. Initially, the advertised rank of vacant forensic positions as well as the current pay scales accompanying those advertisements indicates that the Director of Forensic position on many campuses is viewed as an entry level position. Additionally, in some regions of the country there is a trend to make the Director of Forensic position a staff rather than a faculty line position. This change of status is indicative of a predisposition on the part of university personnel to consider forensics an extra-curricular activity rather than a viable scholarly area of study. Finally, the difficulty of many forensic directors in securing tenure is problematic.

Forensic activities should be the cornerstone of the university community. No other activity on a college campus places such time, research, and social demands on undergraduate students. Drawing on information from all disciplines, successful forensics competitors become adroit at time management and proficient in articulating their views under stressful circumstances. These and numerous other advantages of the forensic experience have been or could be advanced and are known by forensic personnel.

The problem, then, is not that forensic educators are working in an unimportant area. It is the contention of this paper that the most significant problem facing the forensic community today is that we have neither documented nor articulated the importance of our area of expertise to the university community at large. We will continue to be overlooked as a viable area of study until we recognize and begin conducting scholarly research in our discipline. This statement is not meant to suggest that no research exists in forensics but it does demand that we conduct an examination of that research and evaluate its value. Much of the work conducted in the forensic area is either of a pedagogi-

---

**National Forensic Journal*, VIII, (Spring, 1990), 95-103.

SHARON PORTER is an Associate Professor at the School of Communication and former Director of Forensics at Northern Arizona University, Flagstaff, AZ 86011-5619.

cal nature[1] or consists of 'thought' pieces.[2] While not minimizing the importance of these works, they do not technically fulfill the research expectations of many universities. The remainder of this work will delineate why forensic research is important, examine the types of research projects available to forensic educators, and will offer three suggestions on how forensic personnel might become more successful researchers.

Forensic Research Is Important

Although all forensic coaches can offer justifications for why they do not engage in research, attempts to second guess and refute those are beyond the scope of this work. Rather, this section will posit four reasons why it is imperative that we conduct forensic research.

1. *Scholarly research in forensics would enhance the probability of the forensic coach securing tenure.*

The college or university which grants a Director of Forensics tenure without publications is becoming extinct. Whether we personally agree with the publication expectations imposed, those expectations do exist. Porter reports that 73% of Directors of Forensics are employed in tenure track positions, with 86% stating that they are evaluated by the same criteria as other faculty members.[3] 52% of those surveyed indicated that publication was required for promotion/tenure with 71% of the sample who were at institutions requiring research indicating that they were expected to publish as much as their colleagues.[4] Many institutions indicate not only the type of research acceptable but specify a weighing system for evaluating publications. In these schematics the administrative tasks and the weekend responsibilities of the forensic director carry little weight.

---

[1]For example: Dencil, Taylor, "How to Evaluate DuoInterpretation'TAefivmnc (1985): 1-8; Kevin Dean, "Coaching Contest Rhetorical Criticism", *National Forensic Journal* (1985): 116-127; Michael Gotcher and Thomson Biggers, "An Alternative Approach to Negative Speaker Duties in CEDA Debate," *1984 CEDA Yearbook.*

[2]For example: Roger Solt, "Negative Fiat: Resolving the Ambiguities of 'Should'," *Argumentation and Advocacy* 25 (1989): 121-139; David E. Klope, "Toward a Conceptual Justification of Duo Interpretation," *National Forensic Journal* 4 (1986): 1-11; Deanna F. Womack, "The Role of Argumentation in Mediation Styles," *Journal of the American Forensic Association* 21 (1985): 215-225; Dale A. Herbeck and John P. Katsulas, "The Affirmative Topicality Burden: Any Reasonable Example of the Resolution, *" Journal of the American Forensic Association* 21 (1985): 133-145; Mark A. Cole, Ronald G. Boggs, Kevin M. Twohy, "The Function of Criteria in Non-Policy Argumentation: Burdens and Approaches," *1986 CEDA Yearbook:* Walter Ulrich, "The Legal System as a source of Values," *1985 CEDA Yearbook;* and Dwight Podgurski, "Presumption in the Value Proposition Realm," *1983 CEDA Yearbook.*

[3]Sharon Porter, "Evaluating the Forensic Director: Is There a Problem?" *The Forensics* 72 (1986): 10.

[4]Porter, 11-12.

2. *Scholarly research in forensics would elevate the discipline in the eyes of our colleagues.*

Speech Communication, generally, and forensics, specifically, has an image problem. Departments of Speech Communication are frequently called upon to justify their existence as an academic entity. This problem is exacerbated when our research fails to pass the scrutiny of our peers. The number of publications and grants secured signals to others in the academic community the importance of an area as an academic discipline. A recognition and appreciation of this fact is an important prerequisite for enhancing the credibility of forensic education. As Harris, Kropp and Rosenthal indicate, "Scholarship enhances the image of forensics both within the field of Speech Communication and the larger academic context."[5]

3. *Scholarly research in forensics would add to the knowledge of the discipline.*

According to Auer, in general, "research is a means of improving our understanding and way of doing things, through addition to, or adaptations of, present knowledge."[6] As with all other aspects of Speech Communication, the roots to the study of forensics as an area of research can be traced back to Aristotle. The naming of forensic and ceremonial as types of rhetoric and the divisions of logos, pathos, and ethos are relative to our discipline. Research from that time, however, has been sporadic with little or no integration resulting in useful theories. Some of the most profound works of the field (e.g. Toulmin and Perelman) were borrowed from scholars in other disciplines. Members of the Sedalia conference commented, "Because research and scholarship are the foundations from which all specific areas within a field evolve, and because they establish the basics for interrelationships among the areas, a field of study is both as strong and weak as its research and scholarship."[7] Harris and his colleagues urge, "To be viewed as academically legitimate, forensics should claim theoretical grounding. Ultimately the activity is judged by scholars, and the only

---

[5]Edward Harris, Jr., Richard Kropp, Jr., and Robert Rosenthal, "The Tournament as Laboratory: Implications for Forensics Research, *National Forensic Journal* 4 (1986): 14.

[6]J. Jeffrey Auer, *An Introduction to Research in Speech* (New York: Harper and Row, 1959) 26.

[7]"Report of the Committee on the Rationale for Forensics" James McBath and Robert E. Rosenthal co-chairs. Unpublished - developed during the National Developmental Conference on Forensics, sections for the basis for "Rationale for Forensics" by McBath found in *American Forensics in Perspective* (Annandale, VA, Speech Communication Association 1985) in Harris, et al., 14.

way to shed its sophistic image is through the establishment of theoretical underpinnings."[8]

4. *Scholarly research in forensics would enhance the practical application of our discipline.*

"Project Delphia Statements" warns, "Forensics needs hard evidence regarding the transfer value of forensic participation to the world outside academia."[9] Yet, to the detriment of the discipline, this avenue of research is rarely pursued. Consequently, our conclusions and our practices are not grounded in documented fact.

Forensic educators are in an unique and enviable position. Few other areas of study have laboratory experiences as readily available to them as forensics. Regardless of whether we focus on on-campus, community, festival, or tournament competition, whether we participate solely in debate, individual events, or both, numerous opportunities exist to test the theories and practices of our discipline. According to *Forensic as Communication: The Argumentative Perspective,* the link between communication/rhetorical theory and practice is obvious, since they "are best served when progress in one informs the development of the other."[10] This area, probably more than any other, demands we become more involved in scholarly research. How can we claim to be educators until we know what objectives, if any, we are meeting as we currently practice our discipline?

Forensic Research Opportunities Are Available

The 1959 edition of *Webster's Collegiate Dictionary* defines research as "critical and exhaustive investigation or experimentation having for its aim the revision of accepted conclusions in the light of newly discovered facts."[11] In *An Introduction to Research in Speech,* J. Jeffrey Auer, indicates three types of research.

Historical studies are "the study of a period, person or phenomena in human development, in order to record discovered facts in an accurate, coherent and critical narrative that posits causations and probabilities."[12] Although the forensic community conducts few historical studies,[13] this type of research still offers many research opportunities. Work that would isolate a specific time or person in history and explore the strategies employed and/or compare and contrast those strategies

[8]Harris, et. al. 16.

[9]Project Delphia Statements," *Forensics as Communication* 75, in Harris, et al. 15.

[10]*Forensics as Communication* 22, Harris, et al. 15.

[11]Auer 26.

[12]Auer 28.

[13]For example: William D. Harpine, "The Theoretical Basis of Stock Issues," *The Forensic* 70 (1985): 6-14; Thomas Kane, "Rhetorical Histories and Arms Negotiation," *Journal of the American Forensic Association* 24 (1988): 143-154.

with what is being done today would be historical research. Another productive area would be a reexamination and synthesis of the work in a specific area with the articulation of the causations and probabilities that emerge. An example of historical research was conducted by Hale and Boster who looked at previous studies and compared the statistical findings in an attempt to determine the importance of speaking order in individual events competition.[14]

Descriptive research offers even more research opportunities for the forensic educator.[15] "Descriptive research is the study of existing conditions, situations or relations in order to discover or establish norms or standards."[16] Descriptive studies answer questions like "Where are we? Where should we be? What is best? How do we advance from norm to goal?"[17] Perhaps our inquiry should begin with descriptive research. The tournament events and the schedule by which we operate remain relatively unchanged. It would be an educational advantage to determine why students become involved in forensics, why they stay in the activity and the benefits they perceive they acquire by participating in forensics. What is the current status of the events we offer, what do we perceive are the educational objectives of these activities and are these being met? This type of research has implications for reviewing and restructuring events to insure they not only reflect valid educational objectives but meet the needs of our students. Another fruitful area of descriptive research might focus on analysis of judge critiques to determine the role they currently serve in the educational process. These studies can and would establish or verify the norms and standards of our activity.

The forensic community is most deficient in experimental research, which sadly is the type of research that carries the most credibility in the academic community. Experimental research should be the area where forensic personnel excel since there is a close relationship between this type of scholarly work and the activity in which we are engaged. Experimental research is "the systematic study of the operation and effect, or causal relationship, of a single variable factor (and occasionally of several

---

[14]Jerald Hale and Franklin Boster, "Does Speaker Order Matter in Individual Events Competition, *National Forensic Journal* 4 (1986): 45-61.

[15]For example: Dan F. Hahn and J. Justin Gustainis, "'Rhet. Crit.' It's Not Rhetorical Criticism," *The Forensic* 68 (1982): 13-18; Norbert H. Mills, "Judging Standards in Forensics: Toward A Uniform Code in the 80's," *National Forensic Journal* 1 (1983): 19-31; James Tomlinson, "Current Issues in the Cross Examination Debate Association," *National Forensic Journal* 4 (1986): 91-103; Dale A. Herbeck and John P. Katsulas, "Rules on the Substance of Debate: A Critique of the Charter of the National Debate Tournament," *Journal of the American Forensic Association* 24 (1988): 233-245.

[16]Auer 35.

[17]Auer 35.

variable factors), controlled or manipulated in a situation where all other essential factors are held constant."[18] 'Testing a suggested truth, or hypothesis, in order to confirm or disprove it," experimental research seeks the "discovery of an unknown principle or law of behavior, reaction or interaction."[19] When our students advance a new debate case or argument, when they experiment with a new persuasive, informative, or communication analysis approach, or when our students engage in composing their own literature, they engage in the preliminary phase of experimental research. They are, in essence, testing whether or not the strategy they employ will affect their tournament performance. On an even broader level, when the forensic community experiments with new time limits for debate or a new individual event, we are testing whether or not it would be desirable to incorporate that action or event into existing practices.

The problem is that we put our theories into practice before they have been adequately tested. Perhaps this occurs because we are unaware of the methods at our disposal to test our hypotheses. Hickson and Stack indicate that the four methods by which we can design experiments and secure data are survey questionnaires, the laboratory method, field experiments, and field studies.[20]

According to Auer, "A survey is one way to collect data in the field while still exercising control over the research. Typically, surveys are carefully devised questionnaires that ask specific questions, which have been pretested so that they do not bias results. Moreover there are specific and rigorous ways of insuring that the people selected come from the general population under study, these people compose the study's sample."[21] The forensic community utilizes survey questionnaires both at tournaments and when they are sent to the forensic community at large.[22] A tool which appears to be fairly widely used, survey research should be encouraged.

---

[18]Auer 41.

[19]Auer 42.

[20]Mark Hickson and Don Stacks, *Nonverbal Communication Studies and Applications* (Dubuque, IA: W.C. Brown, 1989) 25ff.

[21] Auer 27.

[22]For example: Billy Hill, "The Status of CEDA Debate in the Southeast," *The Forensic* 70 (1985): 57-68; Robert Littlefield, "The Forensics Participation Course: What Is It Really For?" *The Forensic* 70 (1985): 69-80; David A. Thomas, "The Ethics of Proof in Speech Events: A Survey of Standards Used by Contestants and Judges," *National Forensic Journal* 1 (1983): 1-17; Suzanne Larson, "Communication Analysis: A Survey Research Report," *National Forensic Journal* 3 (1985): 140-153; Bruce B. Manchester and Sheryl Friedley, "Consistency verses Diversity in Tournament Events: A Survey of Coaches and Competitors," *National Forensic Journal* 4 (1986): 23-33; Robert Littlefield, "Comparison of Tabulation Methods Used by Two 1985 National Forensic Tournaments," *National Forensic Journal* 4 (1986): 35-43; Edward Harris, Jr., "Judge Demographics and Criteria for Extemp and Impromptu at NFA Nationals," *National Forensic Journal* 4 (1986): 135-147; Suzanne Larson, "Cross Examination in CEDA Debate: A Survey of Coaches," *1987 CEDA Yearbook.*

Little research is conducted in the forensic community in the area of laboratory experiments, field experiments, and field research. Harris, Kropp, and Rosenthal advance six potential areas where forensic scholars can contribute to the field through these forms of research.[23] These include using the forensic tournament as a laboratory to study the relationship between theory and practice, studying the relationship between what we teach and the knowledge we need to succeed in the "outside world", analyzing how human beings process information, determining the effectiveness of teaching techniques, establishing a decision-making rationale, and developing a theory of forensics.[24]

"In the laboratory experiment we attempt to control all the variables in a situation except for those being tested. Even those being tested, however, are carefully controlled in that they are carefully manipulated and their effects noted."[25] The tournament environment appears to be an excellent place in which to engage in laboratory experiments. In fact, coaches often refer to tournaments as cocurricular activities in which the concepts learned in the classroom are tested. Additionally, many universities offer credit for forensic workshops. Either of these settings qualify as a laboratory if the researcher carefully designs the study. Michael T. Ingram's work, for example, could be tested easily in a tournament situation. Ingram indicates that current practices in drawing for extemporaneous topics in tournaments do not take into account speakers arriving late or judges writing ballots. Consequently, the later speakers in the round receive more preparation time than earlier speakers. He advocates three extra minutes between speakers to equalize for these discrepancies.[26]

Field experiments try "to control the variables under study as much as possible by manipulating degrees or levels of variables under study. Second, the field experiment allows other variables that would normally be controlled in the laboratory to influence results. The major advantage of the field experiment, however, is that it allows the study to be carried out in a 'natural' setting."[27] The National Debate Tournament recently adopted a 9-3-6 time format rather than the previous 10-3-5 format. An experiment might be designed contrasting the satisfaction rate of debaters and judges using each of these two formats.[28]

---

[23]Harris, et al. 15-16.
[24]Harris, et al. 15-16.
[25]Auer 26.
[26]Michael T Ingram, "The Logistics of Extemp," *The Forensic* 69 (1984): 12-14.
[27]Hickson and Stacks 28.
[28]In fact, tournament directors at Wake Forest University, who experimented initially with the 9-3-6 format did conduct such a study.

"Field studies have little control except for the objectivity of the researcher. In the field study, the researcher enters a natural setting in an attempt to answer general questions. The researcher must find a way to unobtrusively record the variables of interest while still acting as a participant in the interaction."[29] Many coaches feel that the length of the day at a typical forensic tournament provides an unhealthy situation. Observing and recording the reactions of students, coaches, or both—especially at the end of the competitive day, would be an example of a field study.

Suggestions and Conclusions

Three items can assist forensic educators become more productive researchers. Initially, we will not know where we need to go until we know where we have been and where we are currently. The first item necessary to facilitate forensic research is the creation of an index which catalogs the work in the field. While forensic instructors might wish to conduct research in a specific area, the task of reviewing literature becomes a barrier difficult to overcome. Having an index that would assist in this process by isolating relevant research in a given area would greatly expedite the research process.

Hickson and Stack indicate that "Usually our methodology will be consistent with what we are taught; that is, our training will, to a degree, influence the methods we select later in our research."[30] *The Collegiate Forensks Directory* indicates that eighty-eight colleges and universities currently offer financial assistance for forensic students desiring advanced study.[31] However, how many of these schools actually provide graduate study in argumentation or forensic related areas is unknown. While it would be beneficial to assess the type of academic programs available at these institutions, it would be more desireable to determine the research orientations of these schools. This knowledge would provide information about the research methodologies available to future forensic educators. However, it would not assist those who have completed their formal education. Many people in this latter group have viable ideas for forensic research that fail to result in papers or publications perhaps because of a lack of knowledge in how to design a research project or the means to analyze data once that data is secured. Recently it seems that each summer the forensic community sponsors conferences, yet none have served the function of assisting the forensic educator to become the forensic researcher. The time has come to either design an independent conference or have a segment of

[29]Hickson and Stacks 29.
[30]Hickson and Stacks 23.
[31]*Collegiate Forensic Directory,* compiled and edited by Sharon Porter, 1990.

an existing conference, such as Alta, conduct a training seminar in research methodologies.

Finally, Harris and his colleagues recommend that our national organizations need to "come to grips with how to foster empirical research and cope with attendant problems."[32] Initially, each organization in the forensic community should envision ways in which they can promote research in their various constituencies. A networking between these groups, possibly through the Council of Forensic Organizations, could be beneficial in creating guidelines and the adoption of them by the forensic community at large could go a long way to prevent "...ill conceived or misguided research which might detract from a positive learning environment."[33] Additionally, the organizations that sponsor journals should encourage submission of articles based on empirical research methodologies.

For too long the forensic community has been remiss in providing the research that the discipline needs. This harms our area academically, as well as harming us personally. We must reverse this behavior if we hope to elevate forensics and forensic education to the position they deserve in the academic community.

---

[32]Hickson and Stacks 16.
[33]Harris, et al. 17.

REVIEW OF PROFESSIONAL RESOURCES

Content Analysis for Communication and Forensics Researchers: A Summary of Current Methodological Treatments

Holsti, Ole. *Content Analysis for the Social Sciences and Humanities.* Menlo Park, CA: Addison Wesley, 1969.

Krippendorff, Klaus. *Content Analysis: An Introduction to its Methodology.* Beverly Hills, CA: SAGE, 1980.

Weber, Robert. *Basic Content Analysis,* Beverly Hills, CA: SAGE, 1985.

Reviewed by **Phillip Voight,** Assistant Professor, Department of Speech & Communication Studies, Gustavus Adolphus College, St. Peter, MN, 56082 and **Susan Stanfield**, Instructor, Department of Speech, Kansas State University, Manhattan, KS, 66506.

A survey of recent publications of interest to communication and, more specifically, forensics educators reveals an increasing number of research projects employing content analysis methodology. Whether research interests involve political debates, cross-media studies, rhetorical criticism, survey research, or communication education, the ease of experimental design, and simplicity of interpretation afforded by content analysis methods, may yield positive results in a short period of time.

Content analysis is a flexible means of obtaining information. While traditionally applied to large volumes of data, and focused rather broadly for such purposes as discerning the grammatical patterns or key words employed by a speaker; the method is also quite useful in gleaning specific information about a limited data pool.[1] Communication professionals have turned to content analysis because it is easy to use with students or lay-people as coders; it yields results which are frequently replicable across numerous rhetorical artifacts; it enables cross-media comparison; and because the statistical methods required for the interpretation of inter-coder reliability and the assessment of results are not complicated.

Despite the increasing popularity of content analysis as a methodological construct, many communication professionals are unfamiliar

'For instance, content analysis methods have been utilized to develop ratings systems for the evaluation of student speeches, to analyze academic and political debates, to perform retrospective studies of great speakers, and even to identify common strategies in successful competitive speeches.

with its use. This review surveys three major theoretical treatments of content analysis in the social sciences, and suggests ways in which any educator could utilize this method to enhance his or her research effectiveness.

One of the more useful books ever written about content analysis is Ole Holsti's, *Content Analysis for the Social Sciences and Humanities*, (Menlo Park, CA: Addison Wesley). Published in 1969, the book is no longer in print, but may be obtained in any major research facility or quality used book store. The first chapter of Holsti's book provides a useful overview of the purpose of content analysis and major trends in the development of the methodology. This overview, as well as chapter two (which outlines basic experimental designs employing content analysis) are an essential starting point for anyone unfamiliar with this technique. A lengthy bibliography and a very detailed subject index make Holsti's book easy to use.

Later chapters discuss validity and reliability issues. A careful researcher, however, would want to consult more recent sources in order to be state-of-the-art (particularly Krippendorff, which will be discussed later). Far and away the most useful information contained in Holsti are his simple, straightforward methods of calculating inter-coder reliability. The formulas he presents require little by way of statistical expertise, and meet, if not surpass more recently developed procedures. The one drawback of Holsti's book is his dated discussion of computer-aided analysis. Fortunately, this is one area in which more recent books have concentrated heavily.

Klaus Krippendorff's *Content Analysis: An Introduction to its Methodology*, (Beverly Hills, CA: SAGE Publications, 1980), is a very popular book in research methods courses. Krippendorff is particularly useful for his up-to-date survey of the field, and his extensive glossary of content analysis terminology. The book takes the reader through experimental design in a step-by-step fashion which connects theory and practice. This book contains an excellent description of coding and recording units; a thorough treatment of unitizing and sampling procedures; and useful warnings for researchers concerned with avoiding common internal and external validity threats.

Krippendorff may be criticized for two insufficiencies. Initially, his treatment of computer-aided design is not adequate for most large projects; and is more appropriate for those interested in creating their own statistical programs rather than taking advantage of SPSS, or other common statistical packages. The second problem with Krippendorff's book is its tendency to dwell on philosophical issues concerning content analysis research. Four chapters, for instance, are devoted to such issues as the history, conceptual foundations, and constructs and uses

of inference. The average researcher will find these chapters superfluous.

The brief and very inexpensive SAGE publication, *Basic Content Analysis*, (SAGE University Paper, 1985), written by Robert Weber, would be a useful second source in print for anyone engaging in content analysis research. The book assumes that the reader has completed introductory courses in research methods and statistics. An effective review of the literature is provided topically, as each issue is discussed. Summaries and suggestions for further reading are included in each chapter, and the book is also replete with miniature case studies to demonstrate the methods reviewed.

The greatest strength of this publication is its modern treatment of computer-aided research design, with its attendant emphasis upon specific statistical packages which may be available to the reader. At only seventy-nine pages, *Basic Content Analysis* is unlikely to serve as your primary source, but is a worthwhile purchase for anyone considering a computer-based research project.

These three publications contain additional source information concerning content analysis and experimental design for those who may require further assistance. Holsti and Krippendorff provide enough detail for even a beginner to perform simple content analysis research. Anyone interested in a more sophisticated inquiry will also want to consult D. T. Campbell and J. C. Stanley, *Experimental and Quasi-experimental Designs for Research*, (Chicago, IL: Rand McNally, 1963) for questions regarding research design; Marlija Norusis, *The SPSS Guide to Data Analysis*, (Chicago, IL: SPSS Inc., 1987), for programming information regarding the SPSS statistical package; and Frederick Williams, *Reasoning With Statistics*, (New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1986), for methods of statistical interpretation. Each of these books are excellent for those who are beginners as well as those who may be returning to the field after an absence of several years.

Cooper, Martha. *Analyzing Public Discourse* Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland, 1989.

Reviewed by **Kathleen German,** Associate Professor in the Department of Communication, Miami University, Oxford, Ohio 45056.

One of the most recent additions to the growing assortment of textbooks on the subject of rhetorical criticism is Martha Cooper's *Analyzing Public Discourse* (Prospect Heights, Illinois: Waveland Press, 1989). It is a short textbook (231 pages including the Index) but the size is misleading. This textbook proves that good things can come in small packages.

While coaches and others continue to haggle over the theoretical function and purposes of rhetorical criticism as a contest event, most would agree that a secondary purpose of the event is pedagogical. Rhetorical criticism should teach students about the communication process, introduce them to the elements of criticism, and encourage critical thought. While other forensic activities accomplish these objectives partially, rhetorical criticism is uniquely suited to cultivate the critical stance within the student.

In this context, the Cooper textbook fits well. Its general purpose is to cultivate a critical stance following a thorough introduction to the nature of rhetoric. Perhaps the overwhelming strength of the textbook is that it provides a comprehensive overview of criticism, introducing the reader to a variety of perspectives without losing its central theme of "good reasons." It is engaging for students at most levels. For the novice, the book avoids the pitfall of formulaic rules; for the intermediate, the textbook offers capsule "methodologies" with helpful references for follow-up reading; for the advanced student or coach, it provides a unified view of the field, integrating and relating diverse concepts in creative ways. In short, it is rare to find a textbook with such broad application.

According to its Preface, *Analyzing Public Discourse* identifies four objectives: "(1) to assist students in understanding the nature and function of communication in public controversies; (2) to assist students in developing skills for evaluating argumentative messages about public issues; (3) to help students understand the ways in which communication structures our perceptions of reality and informs our opinions on controversial matters; and (4) to encourage students to participate in the exercise of free speech in our society." (p. ix)

Chapters 1 and 2 provide the context for criticism by explaining the development of public opinion formation; Chapter 3 supplies a method for describing the anatomy of public dispute from a communication perspective; Chapters 4 through 7 generate a variety of methods for analyzing messages. Finally, the nuclear threat, a central problem of our era, is examined by means of the fundamental steps of criticism—description, analysis, interpretation, and evaluation.

Overall, this textbook approaches the function of discourse in public controversy by integrating rather than compartmentalizing theory. In addition, it blurs the boundaries of traditionally separate disciplines. The political perspective is blended with the rhetorical, adapting the tools common to the study of both. Perhaps the best evidence of integrating is reliance upon Gerald Hauser's definition of rhetoric as "the management of symbols in order to coordinate social action."

(p. 12) The definition is inclusive, yet retains the emphasis on human interaction.

Another sign of commitment to expanding the vision of the critic is the choice of subject matter or "artifacts." The chapter on ethics, for example, begins with an interpersonal relationship example, and moves to 1964 smoking commercials, Nicaraguan Contra aid, the 1987 National Football League Strike, a vacuum cleaner sale, a parent-child transaction, the Federal public relations campaign for nuclear testing in Nevada and Utah, the CBS Evening News and Walter Cronkite, the 1976 presidentail campaign, Ivan Boesky's "insider trading" scam, and Richard Nixon's "Checkers Speech." This curious range of scenarios compels the student to apply rhetorical principles to a continuum of subjects from interpersonal to public to mass communication. At the same time, the student is invited to explore ethical perspectives in each case. Added to Walter Fisher's theme of "good reasons," from previous chapters, are philosopher Henry Johnstone's criteria for genuine argument, Richard Johannesen's standards for evaluating ethics, George Yoos' four standards for ethical persuasion, Karl Wallace's dominant democratic social values, and numerous perspectives on evaluating individual speaker ethos. Although appearing disjointed, this approach encourages students to try out different methods to assess which yields the most promising interpretations of each example.

Four primary reasons recommend this book: First, the interaction between speaker and audience in highlighted. The textbook features public discourse as a transaction among social players. This has long been a central feature of contest rhetorical criticism. When student speakers ask the "So What?" question, usually at the end of their analysis, they seek to discover speaker-audience interaction. In other words, they attempt to locate reactions that occurred and to assess the long and short term ramifications of public discourse.

Second, an extensive variety of artifacts are offered as applications. Nonverbal aspects of communication, not often addressed in rhetorical criticism textbooks, are considered as part of the artifact scrutinized by the critic. As the range of topics for competitive rhetorical criticism gradually broadens, this is a timely textbook. Consideration of the non-traditional aspects of discourse encourages more experimentation with media and nonverbal or other symbolic forms of communication. At the same time, the historical roots of rhetoric are recognized, blending traditional with more contemporary approaches to criticism. No matter what their individual preferences, most critics should find reassuring references in this textbook.

Third, this textbook provides multiple perspectives without losing sight of the student as a consumer of rhetoric. The various perspectives

are offered, applied to sample discourse, and related to the central motif of "good reasons." The role of the critical consumer is paramount as is evident by the stress on informed decision-making. In addition, students are engaged in the process of evaluating sample discourse.

Fourth, the textbook is short and direct. While it pivots upon the rhetoric of the "good reasons" theme, it still can be read in part or in its entirety by most students. Ample footnotes direct the student to original works for amplification of each perspective.

In sum, *Analyzing Public Discourse* by Martha Cooper is an excellent resource for the competitor and coach in rhetorical criticism. The textbook suggests to the student what is possible, expands the limits of application beyond the traditional, and provides a mature treatment of criticism which does not insult the beginner, yet provokes thought in the advanced student.

Methods in Rhetorical Criticism

Foss, Sonja K. *Rhetorical Criticism: Exploration and Practice,* Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland, 1989.

Reviewed by **Mary L. Umberger,** Doctoral fellow in the Department of Speech Communication at the University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742.

At the risk of sounding repetitive, Sonja K. Foss's recent book on the methods of rhetorical criticism is very methodical. Although Foss refers to rhetorical criticism as an art, much of her book approaches the act of rhetorical criticism as a science. This is not necessarily bad, for the author's helpful step procedure to eight different methods, and the great attention to detail, make for a clear and concise lesson in rhetorical criticism. While this approach tends to cater to beginning critics, it can also prove helpful to experienced critics as well.

Foss begins to lay out the perspective for the book in the preface, where she asserts her belief in rhetorical criticism as a way of life, not just an academic practice. This belief guides her early discussions of the definition of rhetoric and of rhetorical criticism, but seems to get lost in the later, more practical discussions on how to "do" criticism. However, by laying our her perspective early in the book, Foss does provide readers with an insight into the author herself. Regardless whether one agrees or disagrees with Foss's approach, one cannot deny that it is straightforward and honest.

Once Foss moves into the more "practical" approach to the process of rhetorical criticism, the book's value for beginning critic becomes apparent. Delineating four steps in the process of criticism, Foss expands upon those steps to include answers to basic yet often unarticu-

lated problems in the formulation of research questions. Research questions can be difficult to generate for experienced critics, and can be even more difficult for beginners. Foss offers techniques from the literature on creativity to help stimulate beginning and experienced critics alike. Six techniques, such as "reversal," "asking Why?" and "alterative perspectives," are introduced briefly as a means of conceptualizing a research question from a rhetorical artifact itself. These techniques may prove especially helpful to the beginning critic, who often becomes interested in a specific artifact but then has difficulty formulating a productive research question from that interest.

Foss's methodical approach is also applied to the task of writing the criticism. Foss includes a section devoted to what a critic should cover in the actual essay. Although this may seem obvious to experienced critics, and in fact might seem incomplete to some, the benefit to beginners is great. Foss does not stop at listing and explaining the sections that should be included in the essay; she goes on to discuss the not-so-basic idea of the stance of the essay. And, true to her early presentation of her own perspective, she discusses not only argumentation and coherence as standards for critical essays, but also acknowledgment of subjectivity and presentation of choice.

The eight methods that Foss treats (Neo-Aristotelian, Generic, Feminist, Metaphoric, Narrative, Fantasy-Theme, Pentadic, and Cluster) are organized around those that feature context, those that feature message, and those that feature rhetor. Each method is given a through procedural section, in which the author lays out a series of steps to accomplish in this method of criticism. Again, these steps, although at times elementary, are of great value to the true beginner. Foss also offers a short discussion of the theoretical basis for each method, and shows how these methods have been applied by other critics. She includes a helpful bibliography of additional samples for each type of criticism at the end of the chapter.

Although the strength of this book lies in its methodical approach to teaching beginners the art of rhetorical criticism, it does hold some value for experienced critics as well. As mentioned before, the discussion of formulating research questions offers a rather novel approach to an old problem. Also, Foss's inclusion of the feminist critical method is a welcome addition to any textbook on rhetorical criticism, and her attempt to lay out the steps in the process gives clarity to a method often misunderstood and difficult to teach. While experienced critics, including Foss herself, will acknowledge rhetorical criticism is rarely as simple as a step-by-step process, this book certainly provides us all with a place to begin.

Communication Research Methods

Smith, M. J. (1988). *Contemporary Communication Research Methods,* Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing.

Reviewed by **David Brandon,** Graduate Assistant at the University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742.

As member of the forensic community interested in research of a quantitative nature, they may find a text by Mary John Smith of value. *Contemporary Communication Research Methods* (CCRM) was, according to the author, "designed for a first course in communication research methods or statistical reasoning" (Smith, 1988, p. xvii). With this goal in mind, Smith attempts to emphasize "both 'contemporary' and 'communication' methods of scholarly inquiry" by noting the deviation from traditional methods and the development of new methodologies by communication researchers (Smith, 1988, p. i). Smith thus sets up the quite difficult task of providing an introductory text that at the same time tries to offer a thumbnail description of all communication methodologies. It is this dual purpose that leads to the strengths found in *CCRM,* and also to the weaknesses.

Smith describes the text as broken into four parts, examinating conceptual foundations of contemporary communication research, the logic of statistical inference, contemporary research designs, and contemporary issues in communication research (Smith, 1988, p. xvi). This review will follow the author's breakdown, examining strengths and weaknesses.

Part one, seeking to explain the conceptual foundation of contemporary communication research methods, includes the first five chapters of the text. Chapters one and two offer brief conceptual models and explanations of scientific inquiry and communication research to provide an overview for the reader of the research process. While a satisfactory overview is provided for introductory student, there is no explanation of why the models provided are solely communication research models. Certainly the scientific method is used in other social sciences. Chapters four and five provide strong hands-on descriptions of scale construction and sampling issues respectively. Smith describes in detail how to make Likert, Osgood, etc. scales in the fourth chapter, but does not do the same work in describing how to score or interpret the scales in relation to the phenomena the scales purport to measure. This highlights a major issue neglected somewhat in the text but of great importance to communication research—the issue of matching the measurement to the phenomena, referred to in the text in chapter three as "reality isomorphism". Communication of any type is an

incredibility complex phenomena, only pitifully captured by the best of measurements. This issue is not adequately reflected in the text; the relationship between theory, data, and measurement is not explored in depth. Also, part one of the text shortchanges the importance of cause and correlation in research designs. Again, this may be attributed to writing a text which includes both scientific research designs and fantasy theme analysis.

Part two of the text, encompassing chapters six, seven, and eight, focuses on "the nature of statistical inquiry" (Smith, 1988, p. xvi). Smith and co-author Spresser provide a good hands-on description of how to calculate many of the statistical indices, but are a bit rushed on conceptual explanations. The reader may be left asking "Which one of these do I use? And what does it mean once I have this figure?" In all fairness, this is likely a question asked by reader of every methodology book ever written. Perhaps this material should be placed after the chapter on research designs, and more time could be spent on interpretation; examples may not be enough for some students.

The third part of the *CCRM* deals with contemporary research designs. Smith includes traditional research designs, survey research, and analysis of interactive and narrative discourse as contemporary designs. *CCRM* again provides short descriptions of concepts, yet again the overall philosophy of measurement and experimentation seems shortchanged. The goal of a traditional experimental design is to control all other variables so that only the manipulated variable affects the dependent variable. Arguments about correlation and cause can then be made based on these results. The focus of an explanation of traditional research designs should be on control, manipulation, and specifying the relationships between variables. Also missing are quasi-experimental designs, surely a topic of necessity and interest to organizational communication researchers. Chapter eleven includes survey research, but not quasi-experimental designs. Such an oversight seems particularly damaging to a methodology text.

Part four of the text concerns contemporary issues in communication research, specifically the ethics and pragmatics of communication research and contemporary research paradigms. As must occur, the more sociological/philosophical aspects of doing research become evident in these chapters. While the thumbnail descriptions of ethical issues may again be adequate for introductory readers, there is room for detailed examples of what actual researchers have faced and done in tight ethical situations and the paperwork involved with human subject committees. Similar thumbnail descriptions are given of contemporary research paradigms in the final chapter of the text; the utility of these descriptions for the student-experimenter is not entirely clear.

A variety of strengths exist through all of *CCRM's* chapters. The greatest strength of the Smith text may be the style and manner in which the text is written. Quotes often introduce chapters or topics, making the text a better read than the typical, stultifying methodology textbook. Chapters are set out in a clear and logical manner. Important concepts are highlighted and defines. Summaries and problems are available at the end of each chapter.

The focus on communication is another asset of the text. In fact, this may be the most attractive quality to communication researchers and instructors. However, the focus on communication research is rather inconsistent, moving form examples of past research to examples of research that could be done. Dome sections are bereft of examples. Often, communication seems pasted unnecessarily over common social science concepts. Nonetheless, such a focus is a benefit to those teaching methodology in this field.

Weaknesses, as mentioned, also occur through all chapters of the text. Because Smith tries to cover the methodologies of a very diverse field, nr> single topic is done in great depth. Instructors may wish to supplement the text with further readings and examples if one methodology in particular is to be explored; for example, more on fantasy theme criticism would be justifies. With the majority of the text wanting to focus on scientific rather than interpretive methods, it is likely *CCRM* will be used to teach traditional social science methodology and experimentation. Again, further readings or examples of research may be appropriated and beneficial. More on interpretation of statistical data would be useful.

Thus, Smith's *CCRM* in undertaking the task of explaining the methodologies of a very diverse field opens itself to certain faults. Yet the style and focus on communication are bound to continue to attract those teaching introductory methodology. The text also provides the reader not just with methodology, but somewhat of an overview of the research done on communication; perhaps the text is best read from this perspective.

Case Study As Research Method

Miles, Matthew B., and A. Michael Huberman. *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Sourcebook of New Members.* Beverly Hills, CA: SAGE (1984).

Reviewed by **Linda P. Carter-Ferrier,** Instructor, Department of Speech Communication, University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742.

One research method which seems particularly suited for the forensics director is that of the qualitative case study, which in essence

involves research based upon observations, interviews, and comparative analysis of data. It has been used for many years in such fields as anthropology and history, and is becoming more attractive to those in the social sciences in general.

For those unfamiliar with the method, this book is recommended as an initial and fundamental source. Miles and Huberman present a basic and detailed text on what qualitative analysis is and how it is done.

As Miles and Huberman explain, the data of interest in this kind of work are words, rather than numbers. The analysis involves (1) selecting, focusing, simplifying, abstracting, and transforming the "raw" data which has been collected; (2) organizing and displaying the data so as to allow conclusions to be drawn; and (3) drawing conclusions, by noting regularities, patterns, explanations, possible configurations, causal flows and propositions, and verifying those conclusions (21-22).

Their book explains in logical order and clear detail, along with voluminous verbal and visual examples, how to conduct a qualitative case study. Chapter two covers designing the study, formulating research questions, doing sampling, and selecting instrumentation. Chapter three discusses how to analyze ("code") the data during the collection process, as well as other necessary data collection procedures. Chapter four focuses on methods for drawing and verifying conclusions about a single "site" or "case". It includes numerous choices for formatting and displaying the data and conclusions. Chapter five expands on the single "site" analysis by showing how to do comparative studies of multiple cases. Chapter six offers specific ideas and advice on how to display and how to draw and verify conclusions.

The greatest value of this book and this kind of research is that it offers a clear methodological strategy to the researcher who wishes to ask questions about what goes on, why something occurs, or what the patterns and relationships are among key dimensions. The conclusions drawn from qualitative case studies can be powerful in their descriptive ability, explanatory ability, and their potential for generalizability.

Social Science Research

Babbie, E. *The Practice of Social Research: 5th ed.* Belmont, CA: Wadsworth (1987).

Reviewed by **Judith M. Forsythe,** Graduate Student, Department of Speech Communication, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, NE, 68588.

As Babbie declares in part one of his book, we have been conducting scientific research for all or our lives. With this in mind, Babbie sets

out to lay the groundwork for social science research, its theory, research design, and statistics.

This book is intended to be a *general* social science research text, giving a researcher the background needed to move on to advanced statistical techniques. Given this purpose, Babbie's text is an excellent source for a researcher, especially for a beginning researcher who is not sure where to begin.

After reviewing the background of social science theory and research, Babbie offers an excellent overview of the nature of causation (an important notion considering some researchers still confuse correlation and causation). All through the book, Babbie utilizes up to date real life examples instead of bogging down the beginner with irrelevant studies on topics which no one is familiar. An example is the topic of marijuana smoking and GPA which is used to illustrate correlation and causality. Other topics used throughout the book for illustrative purposes include, AIDS, peace, welfare, and discrimination.

Once the reader is oriented to social science research and its purpose, Babbie moves on to describe research design and the steps involved: conceptualization and measurement, operationalization, and sampling. An entire chapter is devoted to each of the components. Again, Babbie gives a very good overview on the strategy for researching a topic, explaining the purpose of research, and approaches for getting started on designing a study. Within this unit of the text, sections worth mentioning are the discussion on conceptualization (very beneficial for the beginning researcher) and the discussion on the types of reliability and validity. While the statistical aspects of validity and reliability are not described (for this is not the author's intent), the different types of each are described in more detail than many texts offer and in an easy to understand manner. In fact, most of the text is written in a conversational tone that does not weigh down or confuse the beginner.

Progressing from the theory and basic principles of social science and research design, Babbie moves into the pragmatics of different designs: experimental, survey, and field research. Each design is discussed in separate chapters that include sections on appropriate topics, sampling, analysis, and strengths and weaknesses of the design.

The survey research chapter may be of particular interest, especially for forensics researchers who conduct much of their studies through surveys. Babbie offers a comprehensive overview of questionnaire and telephone survey research, detailing the monitoring of returns and response rates. Also discussed is interview surveys. The description of these methods is followed by a useful comparison of the three methods.

Another area of growing research interest (especially for forensic researchers) is field research. Babbie discuses the techniques used in the area and also gives the reader an article on studying everyday life that exemplifies field research.

Another plus in Babbie's text is a chapter on a topic that should be read by all (not just beginning) researchers (some more than others)—Ethics. Babbie covers the ethical issues in social research and offers an illustrative article on the ethical issues of research on human sexuality.

The strengths of this textbook lie in the coverage of social science theory and research and the pragmatics of experimental, survey, and field research. Babbie does not delve into the area of advanced statistics except to give the reader a flavor of what is available (such as correlation, regression, path and factor analysis). Besides, there are many handbooks available that detail these methods. Another strength, as mentioned earlier, is Babbie's conversational tone. If the beginner is becoming confused and frustrated, Babbie's tone seems to indicate "it's all right," after all Babbie does not take himself too seriously (as indicated in his preface, the original title for his first text was *A Survey Research Cookbook and Other Fables).* If you find yourself becoming too serious, check out the glossary of terms for under the definition of many terms is a humorous second definition. For example, 'reductionism': (2) the cloning of ducks; or 'scale': (2) one of the less appetizing parts of a fish. Students, however, should not use one of these definitions on an exam—I already tried.

Survey Research

Fink, A. & Kosecoff, J. *How to Conduct Surveys: A Step-By-Step Guide.* Beverly Hills, CA: SAGE, (1985).

Reviewed by **Mary M. Gill,** Graduate Student, Department of Speech Communication, University of Lincoln, NE, 68588.

Fink and Kosecoff have written an easily comprehendible book about the methods used for conducting surveys. They admit that their work is a compilation of the basics about surveys including some technical and "not-so-technical" material from a number of sources. Fink and Kosecoff state that their purpose is "to teach all those who need to conduct a survey, regardless of how skillful they are" (p. 11). As a result, the text is aimed for simplicity.

Several important topics to be considered in survey research are discussed. The chapter topics are arranged in the order one would consider them from initiating to completing a survey. A strength of this text

is that the authors present a cookbook approach to surveys. Even a beginning researcher could start at chapter one and move through chapter project.

The authors begin with a basic demonstration of what a survey is and when it should most appropriately be used. Fink and Kosecoff argue that the three primary reasons for conducting a survey are: (l) when a policy needs to be set or a program must be planned; (2) when you want to evaluate the effectiveness of programs; and (3) when you are a researcher and a survey may provide you with needed information. Within the discussion of each reason, the authors provide numerous examples to illustrate the kinds of situations where survey research is beneficial. From their analysis, it is clear that numerous forensic studies could be enhanced by using surveys.

In addition, to when and why surveys are used, the authors specifically address how to develop a survey instrument. The types of questions and scales used with surveys are briefly but thoroughly presented. For example, the authors caution against the need to consider the content of the message, the definition of terms used, and the availability of the information sought. Fink and Kosecoff also discuss concerns about putting the survey together. Questionnaire format, ordering of questions, administration of the survey, and pilot testing the survey are all presented as practical concerns.

The weakest discussion within the text occurs regarding sampling and survey designs. Although the basics are introduced regarding probability and nonprobability sampling and cross-sectional, longitudinal, and comparison group survey designs, the information may, at times, be too brief. Fink and Kosecoff's discussion offers an excellent overview but is perhaps not sufficient for the first time reader or survey conductor. For example, determining how large your sample should be is discussed from a statistical viewpoint with fewer examples used than in previous sections of the book. As a result, this discussion may be too briefly presented for the novice to be able to apply it. The authors, however, do supply a bibliography from which the novice could find sources which provide a broader discussion.

While the sampling and design sections are the hardest to understand, the authors do an excellent job presenting the final two considerations of survey research: analyzing data and presenting the results. Following in their basic approach, the authors succinctly present the typical statistical methods used in data analysis. Fink and Kosecoff also present several options for graphs and diagrams that will help

researchers more clearly present findings from their surveys. The examples used in this section are particularly helpful.

While Fink and Kosecoff have done an excellent job of identifying the key topics to be considered in designing and implementing surveys, the real strength of this book rests with the style in which it is written. In addition to providing succinct interpretations of the necessary material, the authors have supplied examples for virtually every concept introduced. Fink and Kosecoff also present a counter example which is not indicative of the concept being discussed. This technique is particularly helpful in sorting out the distinctions in various types of questions and scales used with surveys.

Quantitative Methods for Research

Anderson, J.A. *Communication Research: Issues and Methods,* New York: McGraw-Hill (1987).

Reviewed by **Daniel Mills,** Graduate Student, Department of Speech Communication, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, NE, 68588.

The basic principles of research are important to any study in communication and the cornerstone of much research is methodology. Unfortunately, ominous clouds hang over research in forensics concerning basic methodological approaches. One way of dissipating this cloud is by ascertaining in all forensic research programs that the foundation for studies are sound. The easiest approach is to check the research design against current methodologies. A good textbook to serve this purpose is Anderson's.

Communication Research

The text is thorough in its coverage of the field of communication studies beginning with an explanation of the role of research in communication in the first section. What proves more useful for forensics, and is the focus of this review, is the second section on quantitative research.

Anderson carefully guides the reader through the various terms and techniques for developing new constructs, and the appropriate purpose of the hypotheses within communication research. A quick fifteen page explanation of measurement and its importance to validity and reliability is also provided.

Particular attention for forensic researchers should be paid to Chapter six on sampling. Anderson notes, "We sample... when it is less useful, impractical, or impossible to deal with the whole ..." (p. 145). There are a plethora of forensic programs with a multitude of coaches

and competitors across the country. Attempting to elicit data from all would be an improbable, if not an impossible task. The importance of appropriate measures of sampling this population is of utmost concern if the results of a study are to be extrapolated to the whole forensic community. Anderson does an admirable job of carefully delineating the various sampling types including convenience, judgement, and probability. The reader may run into a little difficulty with the explanation of sampling error dependent on experience with statistics.

A solid understanding of mathematics, however, is not necessary to follow Chapter seven dealing with statistics. Anderson has purposefully avoided long, extended excursions into the mathematical formulas of statistics. What he provides is a solid explanation of the meaning and uses of various statistical methods. A drawback is that the chapter needs to be supplemented by additional information on statistics in order for a complete quantitative study to be initiated.

While the entire textual material for each area may not have to be read due to previous knowledge with quantitative methodologies, it is wise to double-check any study by at least scanning the major headings and the material to be sure the basics are being incorporated and thus insuring a sound research program.