An Assessment of the Value of Individual Events in Forensics Competition From Students' Perspectives

Janet Kay McMillan and *Wm. R. Todd-Mancillas**

Public speaking is one of the oldest academic subjects taught in higher education. In fact, it has been taught continuously since its origin in 465 B.C. (Klopf & Lahman, 1973). Since that time, twenty-four centuries have elapsed and millions of people have received, in some form, instruction in public speaking. During the 20th century, forensics has become an important curricular and extracurricular public speaking and learning activity at most community colleges, four-year colleges, and universities in this country. Approximately 92 community colleges and 357 institutions have forensics programs (Rieke, 1974).

Owing to the prominence of forensics, one would have thought that the activity would have been thoroughly researched and validated. In actuality, such research is lacking. While debate has been thoroughly investigated (Colbert & Briggers, 1985; Crocker, 1938; Matlon & Keele, 1984), very little research has been conducted on individual events. Studies on debate, from the perceptions of coaches and educators (Church, 1975; Crocker, 1938; Edney, 1953; McGlone, 1974; Pearce, 1974), parents (Drum & Drum, 1955), and students (Hill, 1972; Matlon & Keele, 1984) indicate that participants benefit from the activity. Some perceived benefits include improved critical and analytical thinking, communication, argumentation, research, and organizational skills. Knowledge of these perceived benefits has aided in the recruitment of debate participants and improvement of programs.

As with debate programs, knowledge of the perceived benefits (or disadvantages) of individual events could be used in making programmatic improvements and gaining additional financial and institutional support for individual events programs.

The forensics community has for a long time been aware of the need to obtain this information. It was, for instance, proposed during the 1974 National Developmental Conference on Forensics (McBath, 1975), and subsequently endorsed by participants in The Second National Conference on Forensics (Parson, 1984), that research be undertaken to meet the following objectives.

---

1. Research should be conducted to determine why certain persons are drawn to forensics activities.

2. Research should be conducted to determine how forensics experiences can be varied to increase rewards for desired behaviors.

3. Research should be conducted to discover the intended and unintended effects of forensics experience on personality development, cognitive skills, critical thinking, aesthetic sensitivity, and communication skills.

Inasmuch as the above recommendations hold no less value today than they did 15 years ago and, since with the notable exception of Holloway, Keefe, and Cowles (1989), very little effort has been made to act on these recommendations as they apply specifically to individual events programs, the present investigation was undertaken. Specifically, this study sought to answer the following research questions.

Research Questions

1. Who or what acquaints students with individual events activities?

Project Delphi (a special task force in conjunction with the National Developmental Conference on Forensics) recommends that forensics should make an active effort to involve large and diversified segments of the general student population in its activities (McBath, 1975). Knowledge of how students become aware of forensics would be helpful to those individuals administrating recruiting programs.

2. For what reasons do students become involved in this activity?

Knowledge of students' motivations and reasons for becoming involved with individual events should help us determine whether their intents are adequately compatible with the goals of individual events programs. This information would in turn help us determine whether existing programs are adequately serving participants' needs.

3. What are the competitors' perceptions of the advantages and/or disadvantages of participating in individual events?

McBath (1975) reports that we still know very little about the outcomes of forensics training. Answering this research question will help us to determine why individual events programs continue to be popular and understand from participants' perspectives the positive and negative outcomes of their involvement. To some extent, this and the previous question have already been explored by Holloway, et al. (1989). However, inasmuch as their research was confined to a survey of Pi Delta Kappa participants located in the midwest, it is not known whether their results are generalizable to other regions of the country, such as the western region from which the present study's sample was drawn.

4. Are there differences between more and less experienced competitors' perceptions of the advantages and disadvantages stemming from their involvement in individual events activities?

It is possible that one's needs change as one becomes more familiar with individual events activities. Learning of differences in the perceptions of more versus less experienced participants may suggest needed changes in the administration of these programs.

METHODOLOGY

Questionnaire Format

The questionnaire was designed using closed-ended questions so that, as Borg and Gall (1983) explain, quantification and analysis of results could be carried out efficiently. All close-ended questions were numbered and accompanied by response boxes for the respondent to check. The first section of the questionnaire included demographic and preliminary questions. The second section instructed the respondent to use Likert scales in responding to a series of substantive questions. Three open-ended questions were included as well, which allowed respondents opportunity to provide prose responses. The purpose of the study was described at the beginning of the questionnaire and then followed by instructions. Additional instructions were given in the second section explaining how to use the Likert scale.

Participants

Respondents were drawn from the western region of the country. This region was chosen because California has the greatest number of forensics programs in the United States followed by Oregon and Washington (Rieke, 1974).

The sampling frame consisted of a list of schools and competitors obtained from the Governor's Cup State Invitational Tournament, the largest tournament west of the Rocky Mountains, held January 17-29, 1989. The participants surveyed represented 44 intercollegiate forensics teams from public and private community colleges and universities in six states: California, Idaho, Wyoming, Utah, Oregon, and Nevada. Of the 44 schools polled, 19 were two-year colleges, 23 were four-year colleges and universities, and 3 were unidentified. The number of participants from each school ranged from 5 to 20. Those students currently participating in novice (inexperienced), junior (moderately experienced), or open (advanced) divisions of individual events were asked by their directors to complete the questionnaires. All three divisions were chosen in order to determine whether amount of experience has an impact on the perceived value of participating in individual events.

Data Collection and Timetable

Questionnaires were mailed on March 7, 1989, to the directors of the 44 represented schools. The letter explained the purpose of the research and requested the director's participation in distributing and returning completed questionnaires. Directors were asked to distribute as many questionnaires as possible to every active forensics participant. Since it is not known how many participants were active at each school, it is not possible to calculate what percent of each team responded to the questionnaire. An effort was simply made to obtain as many responses as possible from each of the 44 schools surveyed. Ultimately, completed questionnaires were obtained from 26 (60%) of the original 44 schools contacted. Since Babbie (1986) argues that, for surveys of this type, a response rate of 60% is adequately representative, it would appear that the data obtained is sufficient to allow for meaningful data analysis and interpretation.

A self-addressed, stamped envelope was provided for the director's convenience. As questionnaires were returned, the zip code and city postmark were noted and the corresponding schools were then checked off the master list. By March 27, 18% (eight) of the questionnaires had been returned to the researcher. A post card follow-up was mailed on March 24, again encouraging the director to participate and reminding him/her to return the questionnaires. Several of the directors were also contacted by telephone. On April 3, a final follow-up request, this time a letter and another copy of the questionnaire, was sent to all remaining non-respondents.

Statistical Analysis

The Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS), version nine, was used to construct the raw data file and statistically analyze the data. The data were analyzed using three types of statistical methods—frequencies, analysis of variance, and Scheffe t-tests.

RESULTS

In all, 164 questionnaires were obtained from the 26 participating institutions. Among the respondents, 73 (44.5%) were female and 91 (55.5%) were male. The majority (94%) were between the ages of 17 and 21. A plurality (55; 35.7%) were communication/rhetoric majors. The second largest group of respondents consisted of political science/prelaw majors (20; 13%). Among the remaining participants, 50 (32.4%) were majoring in one of the humanities, 19 (12.3%) were business or social science majors, and 10 (6.3%) were from the physical sciences. Approximately half of the respondents (41.9%) were relatively experienced (had participated for three or more semesters), while

slightly more than half (58.1%) were relatively inexperienced (had participated for less than two semesters) individual events participants.

Research Question One

Who or what acquaints students with forensics? One hundred and eight (46%) reported having become involved with forensics through the solicitations of a college instructor/coach, 58 (25%) by a high school instructor/coach, 46 (19%) became involved through a friend, 20 (8%) responded to the "other" category, and four (2%) became aware of individual events through an advertisement.

Research Question Two

For what reasons do students become involved in forensics? Some respondents reported as many as five different reasons for becoming involved in individual events, while a few simply did not respond to this question. A total of 209 interpretable responses were obtained and categorized. These results are listed in Table 1.

Table 1
Frequencies of Reasons for Participating in
Individual Events

Reasons	Frequency
Personal Motivational Factors	
Participated because of an enjoyment of speaking and interpretation as an extracurricular activity	52 (25.0%)
Participated because of a desire to become more competent in oral communication and to improve other skills such as organization, acting, eye contact, and research skills.	61 (29.2%)
Participated because he/she enjoys competition, challenges, and desires to win awards.	16 (7.6%)
Participated because of a desire to travel.	7 (3.3%)
Participated because of social aspects.	14 (6.6%)
Participated because of previous forensics experience	15 (7.2%)
Participated in order to place the experience in a resume, and gain experience to aid in future jobs and careers	11 (5.2%)
Total:	176 (84.1%)
Outside Motivational Factors	
Recruited or persuaded to participate	12 (5.7%)
Participated in order to meet team, course, or degree requirements	15 (7.2%)
Participated in order to avoid boredom at tournaments (Note: debaters tend to have spare time between debate rounds)	4 (2.0%)
Received a scholarship to participate	2 (1.0%)
Total:	33(15.9%)

The majority of responses (176; 84.1%) indicate that respondents first became involved in individual events for personal reasons. Sixty-one (29.2%) became involved in order to become more competent communicators and improve various skills. Fifty-two (25.0%) reported becoming involved simply because they enjoy public speaking activities. Other reasons for having become involved in individual events included: enjoying challenges and competition (7.6%), traveling (3.3%), meeting new people and socializing with others (6.6%), having previous positive experiences when participating in high school forensics (7.2%), and the desire to obtain career-enhancing experience (5.2%).

Fewer participants (33; 15.9%) became involved as a result of having been influenced by an outside motivational factor. Twelve (5.7%) reported having been recruited or coerced into participating, while 15 (7.2%) reported participating as a means of meeting team, course, or degree requirements. Even fewer (4; 2.0%) participated to alleviate boredom at tournaments during spare time between debate rounds, and only two (1%) became involved as a result of receiving forensics scholarships.

From the above requirements, it is obvious that most participants (84.1%) become involved in individual events as a result of personal motivation, while considerably fewer (15.9%) become involved as a result of an outside motivational factor.

Research Question Three

What are the advantages/disadvantages of participating in individual events? Respondents were asked to indicate the extent of their agreement or disagreement with 17 different statements, 12 of which referred to potential advantages and five of which referred to potential disadvantages of participating in individual events. These questions derived from consultation with experienced forensics coaches and participants, as well as from consulting relevant literature (Matlon & Keele, 1984; Pearce, 1974; Rieke, 1974). Moreover, the instrument was pretested prior to its use in this study. The findings are presented in Table 2.

Advantages. Twelve of the 17 statements concern possible advantages of participating in individual events. These statements fall into three subcategories—self-esteem, education, and skills.

The self-esteem category contains two statements. The abbreviated statements, indicated as D and O in Table 2, pertain to personal accomplishment and self-confidence. Of the respondents, 93% and 95% either agreed or strongly agreed with these statements. These results indicate that personal accomplishment and enhanced self-

Table 2
Percentages and Frequencies of Respondents for
Perceived Advantages and Disadvantages

Subject of Statement	SA	A	DK	D	SD*
A. Events too competitive	7 4%	20 13%	16 10%	90 57%	26 16%
B. Gain knowledge and skills for "real world"	92 57%	59 37%	3 2%	6 4%	1 0%
C. Programmed delivery style	18 11%	53 33%	15 10%	44 28%	29 18%
D. Personal accomplishment	81 50%	69 43%	6 4%	3 2%	2 1%
E. Too much traveling	6 4%	12 7%	12 7%	82 51%	49 31%
F. Interferes with doing regular course work	12 7%	62 39%	9 6%	55 35%	21 13%
G. Too time consuming	6 4%	30 19%	16 10%	85 53%	23 14%
H. Individualized instruction	60 37%	52 32%	17 11%	20 12%	12 8%
I. Oral communication	119 74%	40 25%	2 1%	1 0%	0 0%
J. Critical thinking	77 48%	67 42%	2 1%	14 9%	1 0%
K. Organization	79 49%	63 39%	4 3%	13 8%	1 1%
L. Research	61 38%	59 36%	13 8%	21 13%	8 5%
M. Writing	59 36%	73 45%	11 7%	17 11%	2 1%
N. Learn about subjects	84 52%	65 40%	4 3%	7 4%	1 1%
O. Self-confidence	101 62%	53 33%	2 1%	6 4%	0 0%
P. Think Quickly	86 54%	60 37%	7 4%	5 3%	3 2%
Q. Develop ethics	44 27%	65 41%	17 11%	20 12%	14 9%

*Note: Strongly agree is abbreviated (SA), Agree (A), Do not know (DK), Disagree (D) and Strongly Disagree (SD).

confidence are perceived as advantages derived from participating in individual events.

Statements B, H, N, P, and Q are all assigned to the education category, as they all concern some type of learning: gaining knowledge and skills which can be implemented in the "real world," receiving individual instruction, learning about people and subjects, learning to think quickly, and developing ethics. The majority of respondents, 94%, 70%, 93%, 91%, and 68%, respectively, agreed or strongly agreed with all of these statements. The two statements with lower percentages (70% and 68%) indicate that the perceptions of having received individual instruction and having developed ethics are not as prevalent as the perceptions of other types of learning and suggest areas for needed improvement.

The last category is made up of statements concerning various skills. The content of statements I through M pertains to the improvement of the following skills: oral communication, critical thinking, organization, research, and writing skills. Ninety-eight percent of the respondents reported that participating in individual events has helped them better their oral communication skills, while 89 percent reported improvement in critical thinking skills. Respondents also reported improved organizational, research, and writing skills (89%, 74%, and 82% respectively).

Disadvantages. In addition to the advantages reported above, respondents identified two disadvantages of participating in forensics: the learning of programmed ("robotic") delivery styles (45% agreement with Statement C) and interference with regular course work (46% agreement with Statement F).

In addition to responding to closed-ended questions concerning perceived advantages and disadvantages, 64 of the 164 respondents completed an open-ended question in which respondents recorded perceived advantages and disadvantages. As can be seen by contrasting Tables 3 and 4, respondents reported nearly twice as many advantages as disadvantages to participating in individual events. Further, a disproportionate number of the advantages concerned improved opportunities for social interaction and self-improvement, while nearly all of the reported disadvantages concerned criticisms of the nature of individual events activities.

Another open-ended question asked respondents to identify ways in which individual events programs can be improved. The 109 responses to this question were divided into four subcategories: judging, tournaments, events, and education. A total of 54 different recommendations were made (Table 5).

Table 3
Frequencies of Open-ended Responses
Regarding Advantages

Perceived Advantages		Frequency
Improved Relationships		
Enhanced interpersonal communication		4
Gain personal & business contacts		2
Meet new people & make new friends		14
Parties & drinking		2
Team unity		3
Interaction with debaters		1
Competitors root for one another		1
Increases tolerance of others		_1
	Subtotal	8 (64%)
Self Improvement		
Improves presence (credibility)		1
Opportunity for travel		3
Healthy competition		2
Keeps one busy & out of trouble		1
Fun		_1
	Subtotal	8 (19%)
Education		
Learning how to prepare a speech		1
Improved delivery in debate		1
Speeches turn into term papers		1
Learn various coaching styles		_1
	Subtotal	4 (10%)
Assorted Responses		
Scholarships		2
Educational opportunities		_1
	Subtotal	3 (7%)

Table 4
Frequencies of Open-ended Responses
Regarding Disadvantages

Perceived Advantages		Frequency	
Relationships			
Competition among team members		1	
	Subtotal	1	(6%)
Self			
Stress/exhaustion		1	
	Subtotal	1	(6%)
Education			
Not able to hear competitors from other districts		2	
An end rather than a means in the educational process		1	
Not always given credit		1	
	Subtotal	4	(22%)
Tournament Structure			
Strong junior college and four-year division		1	
Attending too many tournaments per semester		1	
	Subtotal	2	(11%)
Events			
Rigid format in interpretation		1	
Existence of a certain formula for success		1	
Cheating and falsifying sources in a speech		1	
Too much emphasis on competing in events		1	
	Subtotal	4	(22%)
Judging			
Unqualified judges		3	
Speeches judged on reasons other than quality		1	
Subjective judging		2	
	Subtotal	6	(33%)

Table 5
Frequencies of Open-ended Responses
For Recommendations

Suggested Improvements	frequency

Judging
A. Training
    A.1 Improve the quality of judges   10
    A.2 Train judges   3
    A. 3 Decrease subjectivity   3
B. Have two judges in preliminary rounds   1
C. Introduce judges in the round   1
D. Have new judges each semester to prevent biases   2
E. Judging Behaviors
    E.1 Comments should be constructive and comprehensive   3
    E.2 Acceptance of a wider variety of styles   1

         Total   24 (23.0%)

Tournament Administration
F. Scheduling
    F.I Hold more tournaments   1
    F.2 Keep panels from over-lapping   2
    F.3 Better organization   2
    F.4 Schedule pattern rounds closer together   1
    F.S More time/breaks for eating & resting   3
    F.6 Provide healthy food   1
    F.7 Increase panel size (number of participants per round)   2
        to provide a larger audience
    F.8 Reduce number of competitors per pattern   1
    F.9 Allow no double entries (allowing one to enter more   1
        than one event during the same time slot)
G. Division Modifications
    G.I Remove junior division   1
    G.2 Do not collapse divisions   1
    G.3 Junior colleges should only compete against other   1
        Junior colleges
    G.4 Keep open & junior division competitors out of   1
        novice rounds
H. Expanding Tournaments
    H.I Increase number of participants, events, and schools   2
    H.2 Establish more high school tournaments   1
I. Other Responses
    1.1 Have a set number of legs rather than basing them   1
        on the number of participants in each event.
    1.2 Improve efficiency of tabulation room   1
    1.3 Stricter enforcement of event guidelines   _ 1
        and tournament regulations

         Total   24 (23.0%)

Self-improvement and Relationships
J. Award personal and competitive successes   1
K. More team spirit at tournaments   1
L. Have casual social gatherings   1
M. Decrease division between individual events and debate   1
N. Encourage people to try new events   3

         Total   7   (7%)

Table 5 (continued)

Suggested Improvements	Frequency
Altering Tournament Events	
0. Interpretation	
0.1 Divide interpretation into humorous and dramatic	1
0.2 Decrease interpretation events	5
0.3 Define difference between acting and interpretation	1
0.4 Less strict timing in interpretation events	1
P. Limited Preparation	
P.I Improve/limit subject matter in limited preparation events	1
P.2 Require one limited preparation event to increase number of people involved	1
P. 3 No previously memorized blocks of information in limited preparation	7
Q. New Events	
Q.I Create new events (no interpretation)	2
Q.2 Create impromptu "prepared" speeches by providing scripts	1
Q.3 Create impromptu storytelling events	1
R. Other	
R.I Increase rotation of memorized speeches (how long one speech may be used)	1
R.2 Define events more specifically	1
R.3 Extend allotted speaking time for events	1
Total	24 (23%)
Facilitating Learning	
S. More emphasis on learning; less on winning	4
X Provide novices with oral critiques in the round	1
U. Establish more workshops	1
V Coaching	
VI More help/attention from coaches	4
V.2 Consistent coaching	1
W. Practices	
W.I More practices	1
W.2 Have group practices before a tournament	1
Total	13 (12.4%)
Assorted Responses	
X. More publicity to get more people involved	1
Y. More public awareness of the activity	1
Z. More support for less successful participants	1
AA. Learn how to be a good audience	1
BB. More funding	6
Total	11 (10.5%)
Uninterpretable Responses	
CC. Less emphasis on analysis than on pathos	1
DD. Decrease politics	1
Total	2 (1.1%)

The results indicate that the majority of participants believe that the individual events program needs modifications in various areas. Eight suggestions were made for improved judging at tournaments. Eighteen called for tournament structure alterations, thirteen recom-

mendations were made for altering or increasing individual event types, seven for ways in which learning can be enhanced, five for ways in which relationships among competitors and their coaches can be improved, five recommendations on a variety of other issues, and two of which were uninterpretable.

Research Question Four

Is there a difference between more experienced and less experienced competitors' perceptions of the advantages and disadvantages of participating in individual events? While no significant differences were obtained when contrasting more versus less experienced respondents, significant and interesting differences were obtained when contrasting respondents with differing individual events experience. Specifically, respondents who had participated exclusively in limited preparation events were significantly less likely to report having gained a sense of "personal accomplishment" (Table 6) than were the respondents who had participated in all three events (limited preparation, prepared, and interpretation events).

Table 6
Analysis of Variance of
Personal Accomplishment

Source of Variance	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F-Value
Between	6	10.533	1.755	3.824*
Within	153	70.242	.459	
Total	159	90.775		

*(p < .05)

Respondents also differed significantly in the extent to which they reported having improved their research skills. As might be expected, respondents having participated exclusively in limited preparation events perceived themselves significantly less likely to have developed research skills than did respondents having participated in either or both interpretation or preparation events. This is perhaps an obvious finding, since the intent of limited preparation events is to facilitate the development of extemporaneous, on-your-feet thinking and speaking, with participants allowed no more than a few minutes to prepare presentations.

Table 7
Analysis of Variance for
Research

Source of Variance	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F-Value
Between	6	33.414	5.569	4.436*
Within	154	193.343	1.255	-
Total	160	226.758	—	-

*(p < .05)

The above two findings indicate that individual events participants are at a perceived disadvantage if they participate exclusively in limited preparation events. It is therefore interesting to note that additional analysis indicates that respondents who participated exclusively in preparation events were significantly less likely to report having attained "quick thinking" abilities than were respondents who had participated in limited preparation events (Table 8).

Table 8 Analysis of
Variance for Quick
Thinking

Source of Variance	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F-Value
Between	6	18.384	3.064	4.742*
Within	153	98.860	.646	
Total	159	117.244		

*(P<.05)

These findings lead us to conclude that individual events participants are significantly more likely to report having increased feelings of personal accomplishment and improved research skills if they had participated in interpretation and preparation events in lieu of exclusive participation in limited preparation events. Conversely, respondents are also significantly more likely to report improved quick thinking skills if they had participated in limited preparation versus prepared (unlimited preparation) events. One can thus conclude that it is advantageous to participate in some combination of limited preparation and prepared events to realize the distinct advantages of each.

DISCUSSION

These results are based on survey responses from a quasi-representative, though nonrandom, sample of individual events participants representing 26 Western Region intercollegiate forensics programs. The findings indicate that individual events participants are more likely to be majoring in the humanities or liberal arts—with a disproportionately high percentage majoring in speech, communication, or political science—than in the natural sciences or technologies. Further, participants report becoming involved in individual events because they enjoy public speaking, and because they seek to improve skills associated with forensics. Seldom, it appears, are participants coerced into participating, although often they are encouraged to do so by peers, coaches, and teachers.

Thus, by word-of-mouth publicity seems to be not only the primary—but perhaps the only—mechanism by which students learn of forensics as a valuable extracurricular activity. This, however, need not be so. There is nothing inherently wrong with advertising as a device to promote this excellent activity among a wide range of possible participants. This possibility holds special promise for aiding in the recruitment of students from underrepresented populations and students majoring in disciplines less likely to learn of forensics though peer and by-word-of-mouth contacts. Both Holloway, et al. (1989) and the present investigators document the dearth of forensic participants majoring in the natural sciences; yet, owing to the rigorous logic needed to successfully pursue course work in these fields, it is apparent that such students would benefit from and at the time same time make meaningful contributions to forensics programs. Perhaps, then, forensic advertising is something that should be given serious consideration.

Respondents identified several positive individual events outcomes: increased self-confidence and feeling of personal accomplishment, improved public speaking, research, and critical thinking skills and broad-based learning about subjects and people. They also report, however, two problems, warranting serious attention: the learning of programmed (canned) delivery styles and the tendency of individual events activities to interfere with one's course work and other academic responsibilities. Both of these phenomena have, of course, been noted by forensics experts for years, the latter recently documented as well in the Holloway, et al. (1989) study. Yet they seem to persist as noisome consequences, perhaps more so among participants and programs more intent upon winning than learning. As such, these findings point to the importance of promoting forensics programs that reserve center stage, as it were, for mastering oral communication skills

that are at once clear, interesting, and relevant, while at the same time not detracting excessively from pursuit of other of one's academic responsibilities.

While no significant differences were observed for less versus more experienced participants, results indicated significant differences as a result of type of individual events activity. Specifically, limited preparation events participants are less likely to report the development of feelings of personal accomplishment or research competencies than are prepared or interpretation events participants. Perhaps the limited preparation events participants, since they devote less time to the preparation of their events, also have less opportunity to develop enthusiasm and interest in their topic; *ergo,* less feeling of satisfaction with the limited amount of research associated therewith. Conversely, limited preparation events participants are more likely to report the development of quick thinking skills than are prepared or interpretation events participants, which seems logical given the nature of the differences in their activities. Accordingly, given the comparative advantages and disadvantages of participating in one or another of these various individual events, it seems preferable that participants participate in both limited and prepared (or interpretation) events in order to develop optimally a broader range of competencies.

However, while plausible, this interpretation and recommendation is tempered by the fact that only 9.2% (15) of the respondents had participated exclusively in limited preparation events. Since this comparison group was relatively small in contrast with the numbers of participants engaged in two or more different events (78%), it may be that the reported comparative advantages and disadvantages were more a function of unequal comparison groups than of real experiential differences. For this reason alone, it is important that this study be replicated, preferably with a representative and robust sample drawn from all regions of the country.

In summary, this study has provided information of possible interest to educators seeking to enhance recruiting and coaching programs, and also suggests ways in which tournaments might be more effectively managed. In addition, this study provides research on individual events similar to that which has been conducted on debate, and provides the forensics community with empirical data useful in substantiating the importance of individual events programs.

REFERENCES CITED

Babbie, E. (1986). *The practice of social research.* California: Wadsworth Publishing Co.

Borg, W, & Gall, M. (1983). *Educational research.* New York: Longman Publishing Co.

Church, R. (1975). The educational value of oral communication courses and intercollegiate forensics: an opinion survey of college prelegal advisors and law school dean. *Journal of American Forensics Association,* 12 (1), 49-55.

Colbert K. & Biggerts, T. (1985). Why should we support debate? *Journal of the American Forensic Association,* 21, 237-240.

Crocker, L. (1938). The values of tournament debating, *The Southern Speech Bulletin, 3,* (3), 5-6.

Drum, J. & Drum D. (1955). A survey of parent attitudes toward high school forensics. *Western Speech,* 29, 53-68.

Edney, C. (1953). Forensic activities: strengths and weaknesses. *Southern Speech Journal,* 19, 6-9.

Hill, B. (1972). Intercollegiate debate: why do students bother? *American Forensics Association Journal,* 48, 77-88.

Holloway, K, Keefe, C. & Cowles, R. (1989). "Who are Pi Kappa Deltans and why do they gravitate to forensics?" *The Forensics of Pi Kappa Delta,* 74 (2), 1-12.

Klopf, D. W, Lahman, C. P. (1973). *Coaching and directing forensics.* USA; National Textbook Co.

Matlon, R. J., Keele, L. M. (1984). A survey of participants in the national debate tournament 1947-1980, *American Forensics Association Journal,* 20, 194-205.

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

McGlone, E. (1974). The behavioral effects of forensics participation. *Journal of American Forensics Association,* 10, (3), 140-146.

Pearce, W. B. (1974). Attitudes toward forensics. American *Forensics Association Journal,* 10(3), 134-139.

Parson, D. (Ed.). (1984). American forensics in perspective. Annandale: Speech Communication Association.

Rieke, R, (1974). College forensics in the United States-1973, *Journal of American Forensics Association, 10* (3), 127-133.

The Nature of the "Total" Forensic Program: The 1990s and Beyond

Bob R. Derryberry*

The decade of the 1980s has concluded with many different voices proclaiming their formulae for educational reform at a variety of levels. Our preparation for a new century introduces an era of transition that often calls for examination, accountability, and scrutiny of existing programs. Few, if any, academic departments or co-curricular activities can escape the critical eyes of administrators who continually seek to fund existing programs and generate revenues for new and expanding curricula.

Our forensic programs have not escaped the harsh red pens or the annual conference tables where deliberations determine what programs remain and grow and which activities meet diminution or deletion. In his remarks at the outset of the 1989 edition of *Intercollegiate Speech Tournament Results,* Dr. Seth Hawkins summarizes the struggle faced by many of us in forensic education when he notes, "There are more than enough forces in the academic world that threaten our activity." Further, he reminds us that "forensics must constantly justify itself and defend against budget cuts, career-obsessed students, and apathetic administrators" (5). Thus, we who believe in the activity of forensics must continually ask important questions, queries which examine our programs and give direction for existence in the following decades.

What sustains a forensic program in an era of scrutiny? Are some supporting arguments or justifications more compelling than others? The foundations of successful programs require sources of funding that are usually built and maintained over time. Clearly, dollars are essential for survival. While numerous programs gratefully acknowledge some support from alumni and friends, others must depend upon their institutions for continued and consistent funding. After comparing forensic programs in 1987, Pamela Stepp and Ralph Thompson conclude: "For the most part, programs are funded through the institution they represent, either through student activities funds or other institutional monies" (132). They also remind us that institutional funds comprise the largest source of support for forensic budgets.

Recognizing the requirements for financial support, some colleagues insist their programs are held together, in part, by strong forensic traditions. They ask, "Can you imagine a liberal arts university without a speech and debate program?" Others take a degree of pride in their abilities to lobby special administrators. Repeatedly I hear, "My dean is a former debater, and our program is fairly secure!" Most of us progress beyond these levels of justification when we realize that college administrations, like other institutions, can change leadership and philosophies abruptly and even frequently.

On a more substantive level, many of us are prepared to theorize at length upon the unique nature of training and competition in forensics. In fact, most of us have probably assembled long documents for review committees about how forensic experience opens doors for diverse student talents. We emphasize that forensics involves an academic synthesis of numerous components with potential to enhance our individual and corporate living. Forensic competition, we state with pride, is preparation for life! It is "real world" involvement by providing the setting and developmental vehicles to meet, advocate, and challenge ideas. Forensics also entails seeking to understand and communicate our literary and cultural treasures.

To bridge the gap between broad philosophical claims about the value of forensics and actual practices and experiences to which students and coaches devote so much time and preparation, specific programs are needed. One particular option is the concept of the "total" forensic program. This particular emphasis, the underlying focus of this presentation, offers critical components which are educationally valid with numerous advantages for participants and sponsoring departments. However, potential barriers to the approach must be recognized and evaluated.

The concept of a total forensic program requires identification to discuss its ingredients and advantages purposefully. Initially one may define the total approach as the most comprehensive program that can be designed, managed, and supported by a particular college or university. It includes involving participating students in forensic experiences that are planned, developed, and evaluated by internal and external standards. Scott Nobles explains that while some observers praise the wide range of current programs existing in colleges and universities as a strength, full programs reflect wiser choices. He writes: "I, too, recognize the necessity for diversity, but I hope it will never serve as rationalization for incomplete programs or as a deterrent to offering full ones" (57). Nobles advises:

> Let me challenge all of us to strive to conceptualize the optimum
> educational program, one with the fullest range of forensics training.

Inability of some to provide an optimum or ideal program is surely insufficient excuse for not encouraging such a model. (57)

The position of this forensic educator is that the challenge of defining and developing the full program concept can be met through careful exploration of its critical dimensions. Although the following treatment of components is certainly not inclusive, it presents essentials serving to explain and support the concept.

The Multifaceted Program

An obvious but vital characteristic of the total forensic program is that it is multifaceted with numerous opportunities for students to develop a wide variety of research, organizational, language, and presentational skills. Clearly, the multidimensional approach helps to fulfill the concept of a total program. The overall organizational goal is generally described as emphasizing participation in numerous individual events along with one or more types of debate competition. While the multifaceted approach involves diverse goal-setting for a speech team as a whole, it also encourages individual speakers to develop multiple skills and proficiencies through varied preparations and performances.

While I certainly affirm that many rewarding forensic programs focus successfully upon a limited number of individual events or even a single debate team, my position is that a program is strengthened through a calculated multi-dimensional philosophy. Further, my own experience in directing the program at Southwest Baptist University underscores numerous benefits resulting from students becoming involved in both debate and individual event competition. Of course, experience also reveals that the scope of a diverse program must be in keeping with sound individual goals, team objectives, and standards for achievement. I believe that the diversified program of forensics offers clear advantages serving to increase return on the investment of time and energy expended by participants and directors of forensics.

The initial benefit derived from the multipreparation approach is that it gives students greater opportunities to experience growth and success. In a typical tournament with two or three flights for entries, a student may prepare and participate in as many as two or three events during each time pattern if ability, scheduling, and physical arrangements allow. I encourage speakers in our program to add events as the academic year progresses. Even if a student begins the year with one prepared public address event or interpretation selection and adds or revises an entry for each tournament, rewarding growth usually occurs.

An essential element of our program at Southwest Baptist University is that students are challenged to prepare for events they have not

previously tried. Sometimes the lure of a pentathlon qualification becomes an effective motivator to attempt a new preparation. The practice of encouraging multiple preparation often convinces the interpretation specialist that he or she can also excel in public address, and even the traditional orator or extemporaneous speaker may discover excitement in communicating a literary work. Student feedback from attempting new forensic ventures is generally positive, and the return of multiple ballots containing suggestions and encouragement often enhances learning and confidence.

The multifaceted forensic program becomes an excellent focus for building a team unit as members develop the practice of contributing to their squad's overall success. At Southwest Baptist, students who are strong in individual events are encouraged to find the appropriate division for debate participation while squad members with debate backgrounds are required to develop individual events in keeping with their interest and select at least one new event each year. My experience with this blending of interests is that a speaker's motivation to assist the team through broader participation also brings a sense of accomplishment to individual students as well. With the adoption of the "team" philosophy, members are given opportunities to take preparation risks for their squad as well as for their own sense of achievement. The team debater, for example, who says, "I'm not an oral interpreter. I've never done it, but I'll give it a shot," contributes significantly to a team effort while also encouraging others by his example.

The multifaceted approach in forensics not only helps to solidify a program with committed student involvement, but it also promotes a unified public relations arm for a college or university. There is a strong advantage in having one recognized forensic entity that is also seen as the provider of numerous services for other academic departments and the university as a whole. In a convention paper presented in 1977, Jack Kay described the diverse program as providing a "vital support system" linking the university and the forensic program (7). The multifaceted approach is also emphasized by the leadership of Dr. Sam Cox at Central Missouri State University, where a vital part of the annual forensic calendar is a service provided to the community and university through audience debates (11). The practice exists on numerous other campuses as well.

The Audience Dimension

A total forensic program does not grow in a vacuum. Hence, an essential requirement of this emphasis is that speakers, debaters, and interpreters need experience in communicating with a variety of listeners. The benefits of such a practice are too significant to ignore if

we want all dimensions of competitive individual events and debate to survive and meet educational goals.

Failing to recognize the vital role of audiences in forensic training has to be noted as a serious and frequent mistake. A simple but pointed scenario introduces the practice of ignoring the important place of diverse audiences in the total forensic experience. Members of the speech team on my campus often lamented that numerous university students and faculty faithfully supported the varsity basketball team, but few persons knew or seemed to care about attending the open debates and speech programs hosted by the forensic team and the communication department. After conducting a publicity campaign throughout campus, a featured audience debate was scheduled. To the dismay of some of the debaters, a number of listeners, who were fascinated with the published national resolution for the evening, were simply "turned off" by what they heard. More than one audience member commented, "I couldn't understand them. They didn't talk to me." Others said, "The speakers didn't speak in my language." Such observations provided revealing and enlightening feedback about language choices and rate of speaking. The hard-hitting comments not only contributed to the debaters' preparation for an upcoming tournament, but the speakers also learned the essential place of audience analysis. The experience reinforced the observation that forensic events and debate speeches must be adapted to listeners whether one's audience is a single judge or a gathering of 300 persons in the university auditorium.

Recognizing and preparing to speak for an audience consisting of more than a single judge or panel is not only a sound element of communication training, but the practice represents a pedagogical goal of lifting forensic activity from the realm of academic gamesmanship to "real life" involvement. Specific benefits derived from including numerous public audiences in the total forensic program merit brief but important delineation.

A striking advantage derived from encounters with audiences comprised of more than a single judge is that speakers and interpreters recognize the contest critic as one particular type of audience; other listening environments involve judgment and feedback from another context. Debating, speaking, and interpreting before a variety of public audiences ranging from literature classes, political science seminars, service clubs, and religious organizations clearly elicit adjustment to a variety of listeners.

The total forensic program involving a variety of audience settings avoids supporting the idea that a special audience situation is required for a student to speak. Indeed, the usual judging environment with the

critic seated with ballot or flow pad in hand can encourage such an unrealistic view of "giving one's speech" that the important premise of a public communicator sharing with others is slighted or distorted. Nobles echoes the wisdom of debating for "real" audiences as he asks: "Is it possible that we can become so specialized and esoteric in our learning models that the art of successful advocacy in a variety of public forums becomes a lost or, at best, low-priority goal in forensics education?" (56)

To ignore the necessity of encouraging and even requiring speakers and debaters to communicate with varied audiences certainly involves a serious mistake in designing future goals. The evaluations of former debaters, for example, are often firm in their affirmation of difficulties in bridging the gap between the contest round and the real world. From his own experience, speechwriter Lee Huebner mentions the danger that debaters are trained so that they cannot speak effectively with non-debate audiences. He explains that many former debaters must work at breaking habits developed from tournament experiences that are described as "irrelevant and even counterproductive elsewhere." Tb overcome these problems, he proposes that "there should be far more emphasis on audience debating—and even audience balloting" (6). Likewise, individual events from interpretation of poetry to informative address can encourage the development of personal effectiveness in communication when repeated opportunities are given for actual and varied audience experiences.

A practical justification for emphasizing diverse audience experiences in the total program is its function as an important extension of the tournament schedule. The excitement of speaking, reading, and debating for different listeners usually generates far more impetus than merely scheduling another practice session. On our campus, the hosting of a forensic night provides a valuable vehicle to motivate the completion of preparation for a tournament while also bridging gaps in a semester's schedule. Similarly, open audience debates between announced teams give opportunities to test the strength of new cases and allow listeners to gain new perspectives on a topic of concern. Often special invitations to faculty members from disciplines such as political science, sociology or English can mean the acquisition of in-depth critiques that aid in producing substantive growth.

Including communication with diverse audiences brings the added benefit of local campus and community recognition. As forensic dimensions such as interpretation, public address, and debate share programs appropriate for various groups, the total program gains visibility and rapport with community leadership. For example, within a short period of two weeks, our speakers often present their oratory and informative

entries for civic clubs, perform literary selections for local study groups, and give demonstration debates for campus audiences. Beyond the growth achieved by students through communicating in a variety of settings, numerous public groups learn about university forensics.

Providing Access and Development

The total forensic program must remain sensitive to the problem of access in admission, theory, and practice. When Don Swanson addressed the Pi Kappa Delta Developmental Conference at St. Louis in March, 1989, he dealt with the problem of elitism in forensic activity. Citing such barriers as tournament qualifications, specialized judging, entry level criteria, and esoteric styles of presentation, Swanson alluded to specific signs of elitism in debate which also apply to numerous forensic events and practices. He concluded that the problem of elitism is evident when barriers "significantly limit the ability of quality students to participate" (13). Indeed, difficulties associated with balancing recognition of achievement with the need to provide access and development of new talent must be confronted by forensic educators desiring to foster the important blend of openness and recognition of quality.

The potential hazard of limited access in approaching decades can be traced to a number of practices that counter a total or open philosophy. While some programs are building speech and debate squads consisting of larger rosters of participants than ever before, others remain small, occasionally focusing on a single debate team or a very limited number of speakers or interpreters. On a number of campuses the tradition of having only a few persons interested in speech competition is reinforced by administrative expectations. In such cases a cycle of inadequate budgeting, low expectations, and poor visibility contributes to preserving the status quo. Such an observation, however, should not be used to describe those active and productive programs operating with very limited dollars and overcoming serious obstacles to maintain small but rewarding forensic programs.

Limited access becomes a barrier to a total forensic program through some practices established in secondary schools and continued in collegiate programs. Even indirect denial of entry to forensic involvement continues to deter worthy and talented students. At the beginning level, Malcolm Sillars and David Zarefsky conclude that we "may be missing large numbers of students because our programs are geared to students from relatively well-educated homes" (88). If such an observation describes some of our nation's secondary programs, the same condition may also be observed in university forensic programs

requiring or often assuming high school experience as an entry or quali-
fying prerequisite.

My experience leads me to maintain that a total forensic program is
hampered by our failure to provide adequate instruction in forensics at
college and university levels. Again, Sillars and Zarefsky note:

> Even in colleges and universities, the role of pedagogy in forensics
> requires reexamination. In many institutions, teaching in forensics is
> merely an offshoot of the intercollegiate debate program. An under-
> graduate course in argumentation is often a performance course
> largely for debaters and prospective teachers of debate. Such courses,
> although valuable, are insufficient means of teaching the broader
> perspective of forensics. (89)

Too frequently we in forensic education have been content simply to
extend secondary programs and experiences instead of providing vital
educational junctions for examining students' past experiences and
opening new doors for questioning and growth. Total forensic
programs, I insist, must not simply replicate prior secondary training of
students in individual events or debate competition. Instead, students
need to be encouraged to attempt new and different events and debat-
ing formats. With equal emphasis, participants need to be exposed to
theories of communication and interpretation underlying the activities
in which they actively participate.

Despite encouraging signs of change, efforts to open doors for
beginners in forensic competition need increased support. Although
initial participation in individual event categories is usually more easily
accomplished than entry into competitive debate, both categories can
do more to attract newcomers. Specifically, I find that a student inter-
ested in forensics can be encouraged to research and write a public
address entry or cut and prepare an interpretation selection as an
avenue for competition. However, in most tournament experiences, he
or she must immediately compete with very experienced or "seasoned"
performers. Too few efforts are made to encourage beginners through
special divisions of tournament offerings.

In debate competition, numbers of talented students are discour-
aged by the lack of beginning divisions for young advocates. Despite
desires to compete, many potential debaters experience intense frus-
tration in attempting to learn so much so rapidly. Because they fail to
develop the command of debate language, organizational methods, and
flowing skills necessary to compete with experienced students, they fail
to achieve enough success to encourage continuing.

Formal opportunities for beginners in debate competition remain
limited. The current American Forensic Association calendar of tour-
naments, for example, includes over 200 entries, but fewer than half of

them publish divisions for novices, rookies, or beginners (8-21). Additionally, it has been my experience that some tournament officials often find it necessary to combine divisions to attain a desired number of elimination rounds. Thus, new recruits from communication classes or argumentation courses are entered in junior divisions because beginner opportunities are not offered. At other times, these same students are placed in collapsed divisions and may actually debate senior teams for their first intercollegiate experiences. As directors of an activity with strong pedagogical interests and commitment, we must question the values motivating our practices. Is the number of elimination rounds more important than providing a competitive environment supportive of beginners? Must we assume that debate and individual event competition exist primarily for those experienced from secondary programs? Indeed, opportunities to increase the number of persons involved and the conceptualization of forensics as a learning activity require us to encourage beginners. The total program of approaching decades must work for balance in rewarding achievement while also providing access and development opportunities.

Evaluative Feedback

The need for access to participation and the maintenance of sound educational premises necessitate a related component in the total approach to forensics: the effective use of evaluative feedback. Thus, we must continually examine the rationale underlying forensic participation. Questioning why we maintain a program is not only purposeful in refining goals for participants, but it is necessary to justify a co-curricular activity with a sound academic foundation.

Feedback provided by active forensic participants and former students continues to disclose important findings as to why students are motivated to participate in forensics. While motivational theorists remind us that we increase expectancy of succeeding by experiencing success (Keller 418), we still have to ask what is meant by "success." The answer must include scrutiny of the reasons students give for being a part of the demanding routine of preparation and competition. In the study of Pi Kappa Delta affiliates conducted by Hal Holloway, Carolyn Keefe, and Robert Cowles, researchers found that students looked beyond winning when they listed their reasons for participation in forensics. The study discovered that 69 percent of students surveyed indicated that learning communication principles and techniques was more valuable than winning, and 74 percent valued their relationships through forensics more than winning (10). Such feedback is certainly insightful in our constant search to understand the motivation of participants. It also directs us to listen continually to speakers comprising our

programs. Their responses, no doubt, can help us direct our energy and resources in the decades to follow.

Potential Barriers

With the numerous justifications and advantages supporting the total approach to forensics, potential barriers remain. We must also observe a number of pitfalls associated with components presented earlier.

I agree with the research findings repeatedly contending that forensic programs will continue to depend upon their sponsoring departments of communication and their parent colleges and universities. Such a relationship must be strengthened by continued efforts to apprise college administrators of the unique values derived from forensic programs. As noted, the total program of forensics offers numerous features making participation pedagogically sound as well as rewarding to the sponsoring university or college. The potential danger, however, is the gradual deterioration or neglect of communication between programs and their parent departments and institutions.

The multifaceted approach, the heart of the total program, faces a number of challenges. For example, extended tournament schedules in both debate and individual events often make it increasingly difficult for gifted and extremely serious students to be away from classes to participate for longer periods of time. Other tournaments, because of time factors, schedule individual events and debate so that speakers may not participate in both divisions of a tournament. Thus, students desiring and preparing to debate and compete in individual speech and interpretation events are sometimes denied opportunities. Additionally, some students find they must specialize in limited events or debate to achieve their standards of success. Even though the rationale for their choices is certainly understandable, they miss opportunities to develop additional skills gained through diversity of preparation.

Despite significant benefits derived from participation in national tournaments at the conclusion of a forensic year, some speakers and programs focus so narrowly upon achieving individual qualifications that team growth is neglected. Caution should be taken to link individual and team goals in order to strengthen squad unity and enhance member satisfaction. The total forensic approach can help to meet goals of motivated individuals and the team as a whole.

The broader audience experiences of the total forensic concept can certainly be accomplished with deliberate planning, but much of the success of this dimension depends upon the dedication of the director of forensics and the willing support of members of the speech team. The audience element can be an integral part of any program regard-

less of its depth or limitations. However, the total program with debate, individual speaking events, and oral interpretation is certainly superior to the program consisting of one dimension. On the other hand, limited programs not only deny potential vehicles for development of talent, but they also curtail potential service to the local community. The failure to utilize varied audiences to enrich all dimensions of the total program involves a loss.

We have also seen that some students continue to face entry limitations in developing forensic skills, and deliberate and unintentional practices and circumstances can combine to shape forensics as an elite activity. Even well-meaning programs and organizations can pose barriers for the total forensic program philosophy. Additional research and discussion of potential limiting forces are needed in our era of transition. Certainly, any future measurement of success should include evaluative feedback from student speakers and interpreters, those for whom our programs exist. Just as sound educational premises retain value only as they are scrutinized and tested, the concept of the total program of forensics also merits continued definition and evaluation from all segments of the forensic community.

Works Cited

Cox, E. Sam, and Scott L. Jensen. "Redeeming Part of Debate's Educational Mission Via Public Formats." Unpublished convention paper. 1989.

Hawkins, Seth C, ed. *Intercollegiate Speech Tournament Results.* New Haven, CK Great Eastern Forensic Services, 1989.

Huebner, Lee W. "The Debater, the Speechwriter and the Challenge of Public Persuasion." *Journal of the American Forensic Association* 7 (1970): 1-12.

Holloway, Hal, Carolyn Keefe, and Robert Cowles. "Who are Pi Kappa Deltans and Why Do They Gravitate to Forensics?" *The Forensic* 74.2 (1989): 1-12.

Kay, Jack. "Advantages and Disadvantages of Participating in Both Individual Events and Debate." SCA Convention. Boston, 5 Nov. 1987.

Keller, John M. "Motivational Design of Instruction." *Instructional-Design Theories and Models: An overview of their Current Status.* Ed. Charles M. Reigeluth. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1983. 383-434.

Nicolai, Michael X, ed. AFA Tournament Calendar 1989-90. Menomonie, WI, 1989.

Nobles, Scott. "The Issues of Forensics." *Forensics as Communication.* Ed. James H. McBath. Skokie, IL: National Textbook, 1975. 53-58.

Stepp, Pamela L., and Ralph B. Thompson. "A Survey of Forensics Activity at Selected Colleges and Universities in the United States, 1987." *National Forensic Journal 6.2* (1988): 121-36.

Sillars, Malcolm O., and David Zarefsky. "Future Goals and Roles of Forensics." *Forensics as Communication.* Ed. James H. McBath. Skokie, IL: National Textbook, 1975. 83-93.

Swanson, Don. "The Future Role of Pi Kappa Delta: Our Challenge for the Year 2000 and Beyond." *The Forensic* 74.4 (1989): 13-23.

Interpreting the Oral Interpretation Judge:
Content Analysis of Oral Interpretation Ballots

Daniel D. Mills*

One of the primary purposes behind forensics competition is the pedagogical benefits students receive from participation in the activity. One of the best methods of advancing a pedagogical base is through the ballots students receive at tournaments. Carey and Rodier (1987) state, "ballots play an important role in the educational process of literature performance and in the forensic activity" (p. 16), and Jensen (1988) notes, "... the benefits competitors receive during the actual tournament are achieved through the critic in each section of any given event" (p. 1). Comments students receive should provide insight into how a competitor might improve in a particular event. However, complaints about comments or a lack of comments are not unusual.

Pratt (1987) noted a ballot serves the two purposes of judging and coaching, and Allen (1983) noted:

> One way or another critics must be held accountable for their estimates of performance. They must be able to defend the rankings they assign, and this means being able to justify specific hierarchical standards which are applied to performance. Otherwise we must accept that a great deal of judgment is, alas, based on impressions only, and that such impressions are based on conjecture and opinion as much as fact (p. 52-53).

This study examines written comments students receive on oral interpretation ballots. The first purpose of this study is purely pragmatic—to develop a better understanding of the criteria used to judge competitive oral interpretation events. A second purpose is to examine possible implications resulting from these current practices. While constructive guidelines concerning the judging of individual events have been suggested (Hanson, 1988; Lewis, 1984; Mills, 1983; Ross, 1984; Verlinden, 1987), it is also important to substantiate what is actually occurring in the judging of oral interpretation events.

Content analysis of individual event ballots has primarily been undertaken in original speaking events (Jensen, 1988; Pratt, 1987) and rhetorical criticism/communication analysis (Harris, 1987; Dean & Benoit, 1984). Carey and Rodier (1987) went the other direction and

undertook a content analysis of oral interpretation ballots. They divided the content into five principal areas: quantity of comments, format of ballot, types of comments, valence, and advice. She used five pre-set categories: 1) selection; 2) presentational skills; 3) personal comments to contestants; 4) judge disclosure of personal preferences or judging style; and 5) comments written in the form of questions (p. 6). While this study has proven helpful as a starting point in determining what is written on oral interpretation ballots, a more thorough description of the comments is needed in order to understand what issues/ areas are being addressed by judges.

Rather than use pre-set categories, this study allowed the categories to generate themselves from the comments. This process gives a clearer picture of what is being written on ballots. A comprehensive knowledge of ballot comments may prove beneficial in better preparing students for competition, and point out potential "problem areas" within the activity.

Method

Two hundred and fifty individual-event ballots were randomly selected for use in this study. Fifty ballots were randomly selected from each of the five areas of oral interpretation common on the intercollegiate forensic circuit in the 1989-1990 season: oral interpretation of poetry, oral interpretation of prose, dramatic interpretation, dramatic duo and program oral interpretation. Fifty ballots per event was predetermined in order that comparisons could be made across the five events. The ballots were written for students from a large midwestern university at invitational tournaments during the 1989-1990 season. While all the ballots are for students from the same university, this should not be a major limitation. It is assumed judges do not dramatically alter comments for students from any particular school. The predominant number of ballots are from the American Forensic Association district in which that university resides; however, a national representation is achieved with ballots written by judges at East and West coast invitational tournaments.

In order for comparisons to be made concerning the number of comments, the method used by Carey and Rodier (1987) was replicated. Each ballot was broken down into its "smallest unit possible . . . a generic comment like 'very enjoyable,' or 'good job,' was counted in order to identify the total number of comments being made," and "if a comment was a restatement, it was still counted twice" (Carey & Rodier, 1987, p. 5). This method is compatible with the syntactical method of unit analysis offered by Krippendorf (1980).

The development of the categories in this study followed Berelson's (1952) definition of "what is said," specifically, a subject-matter orientation. This study did not make use of any preset categorization system. Rather, a preliminary classification placed the comments into as many categories as necessary in accordance with the Berelson's (1952) perspective that categories are only limited by imagination. Fifty-eight categories emerged from this process. These categories were then reviewed with the purpose of discovering broader headings under which specific categories may be included (i,e., the major heading of "Variety" was developed to include general comments on variety along with more specific comments on vocal variety and nonverbal variety.) This process resulted in a final taxonomy of 19 categories.

The 19 categories listed in alphabetical order (and the specific categories from which they were formed) are:

1) *Blocking—*specific comments on physical movement (only relevant within dramatic duo);
2) *Character—*comments on acting, characterization, nonverbal characterization, vocal characterization, distinction between characters, nonverbal distinction between characters, vocal distinction between characters, interaction between characters, focal points of characters, miming action of characters, and thought process of characters;
3) *Decision—*specific justification by the judge for the rank and/or rate;
4) *Delivery—*vocal, conversational, pronunciation, enunciation, speed, tone, volume, vocal quality, nonverbals, movement, eye contact, facial expression, gestures, pacing, pause, and timing;
5) *Emotion—*emotional display and perceptions on feeling the emotion being conveyed;
6) *Familiarity with Material—*perceptions on how well the competitor knows the selection(s);
7) *Interpretation of the literature—this* was primarily suggestions on how specific line(s) should be interpreted;
8) *Introduction—*comments on content of introduction;
9) *Involvement—*student's engrossment with delivery or literature; the internalization of the material;
10) *Material—*author(s) name(s), author intent, cutting of material, how the story builds, offensive language in material, literary merit, material selected, teaser, theme, title(s);
11) *Pacifier—*comments intended to "pacify" a negative reaction by the student to either a comment or to the rank (i.e., "tough round," and "this was a really close round");

12) *Pat on Back*—comments which are "positive strokes" for the competitor (i.e., "You're a super competitor!");

13) *Personal*—comments of a personal nature to the competitor (i.e., "Good to see you out on the circuit again");

14) *Presence*—specific comments on the competitor's presence during the round;

15) *Scriptbook*—comments related to the speaker's use, misuse, or non-use of the script;

16) *Technique*—comments which specifically mentioned a interpreter's use of technique;

17) *Time*—time of the presentation and comments related to the time/length of the presentation;

18) *Variety*—comments specifically addressing nonverbal and vocal variety;

19) *Visualization*—comments on the competitor "seeing" what is described or happening in the story.

Each comment was also identified by its corresponding oral interpretation event, directionality of the comment, and the rank received on the ballot. Due to the standard practice of ranking "5" the last two speakers in a round of 6, all ballots with a rank of "6" were converted to a "5." The use of directionality is a common practice in content analysis and maybe used to determine criticism-praise (Emert & Barker, 1989). Directionality was employed to determine positive, constructive and neutral comments. Positive comments were deemed those remarks which supported the way a student handled any of the 19 categories (i,e., "I really like the way you present this character"); constructive comments offered advice for change or questioned a student on one of the 19 categories (i,e., "I think the man should be a little older" or "why is the kid so whiny?"); neutral comments carried no valence for reinforcement or change (these were commonly comments on time, title and theme).

Results

The 250 ballots yielded 2,596 comments, an average of 10.38 comments per ballot. The range of comments was from 0 to 28. The comments were distributed across the 50 ballots per event, with poetry interpretation having a mean of 11.38 comments per ballot, dramatic duo 10.72, prose interpretation 10.70, dramatic interpretation 9.62, and program oral interpretation with a mean of 8.90 comments per ballot (see Table 1).

In addressing all five oral interpretation events as a whole, Table 2 identifies what students and coaches can expect to see on ballots. The most commonly written comment was focused on material (25%). The

Table 1: Distribution of Comments

Event	N Ballots	N Comments	Mean per Ballot
All Events	250	2,596	10.38
Interpretation of Poetry	50	599	11.98
Dramatic Duo	50	536	10.72
Interpretation of Prose	50	535	10.70
Dramatic Interpretation	50	481	9.62
Program Oral Interpretation	50	445	8.90

* Listed in rank order from most to least

Table 2: Rank Order of Categories for All Oral Interpretation Events

Classification Comments	N	% of Total	Mean Per Ballot
Totals	2596	100%	10.38
MATERIAL	649	25.00%	2.60
CHARACTER	458	17.64%	1.83
DELIVERY	426	16.41%	1.70
INTERPRETATION	218	8.40%	.87
PAT ON BACK	159	6.12%	.64
TIME	127	4.89%	.51
INTRODUCTION	115	4.43%	.46
FAMILIARITY	84	3.24%	.34
VARIETY	77	2.97%	.31
EMOTION	76	2.93%	.30
INVOLVEMENT	66	2.54%	.26
SCRIPTBOOK	45	1.73%	.18
VISUALIZATION	24	.92%	.10
TECHNIQUE	18	.69%	.07
PERSONAL	16	.62%	.06
PACIFIERS	14	.54%	.06
BLOCKING	11	.42%	.04
PRESENCE	10	.39%	.04
DECISION	6	.23%	.002

*Blank spaces indicate there were no comments for that particular category.

most frequent comment in "Material" dealt with how the material was cut (n = 214), and the material selected (n = 170) for competition. The second and third most frequently noted categories are close in total comments. "Character" was second with a total of 458 comments (17,64%) and "Delivery" was noted 426 times (16.41%).

The category receiving the least attention on all 250 ballots was "Decision." Only six comments were a specific reason for a rank and/or rate. Two examples of decision-based comments include, Top 3 showed more diversity and greater technical proficiency in performance" and "I went for a piece that had character interaction and variation in emotion."

Within each of the five oral interpretation events a rank order was also determined. Examination of the most frequently written comments for each event illustrates that all five events are highly similar. Comments on character, material, and delivery were the three most frequently mentioned comments in all five events. These three categories also consistently comprised the majority of comments for all the events. Character, material, and delivery comments made up 63.82 percent (n=307) of the average dramatic interpretation ballot, 61.68 percent (n=330) in prose, 60.26 percent (n=323) in dramatic duo, 59.78 percent in program oral interpretation, and 51.25 percent (n=307) in poetry.

While more variation was evident in the least commonly mentioned categories in the five events, certain categories were still dominant. Blocking was the lowest-ranked category in four of the five events. However, this low number of comments is easily accounted for—blocking was only evident within dramatic duo. The other category consistently on the low end of the spectrum is "Decision." Four of those decisions were written on poetry ballots, one in dramatic duo, and one in program oral interpretation.

A few of the categories in the mid-frequency range deserve attention. Students received a "pat on the back" from judges 159 times, but were offered "pacifiers" only 14 times. It is interesting to note that 45 comments were focused on the scriptbook and 18 comments specifically addressed technical performance. Aspects which may relate a link between the student and the literature (emotion, involvement, visualization) received only 6 percent (n = 166) comments.

The data collected also allowed for comparisons between the number of comments and the ranks received by the students. The results, as listed on Table 3, clearly reveal the higher a student ranks in a round, the more comments will be written on the ballot. A rank of "1" had a mean of 11.33 comments per ballot compared to a rank of "5" with a mean of 9.11, a difference of 2.22 comments per ballot. The biggest decrease in number of comments is seen between a rank of "3" and "4." While not substantiated, this difference may be linked to a "top 3, bottom 3" perception.

Table 3: Distribution of Comments According to Rank

Rank	N Comment	N Ballots	Mean per Ballot
1	544	48	11.33
2	604	54	11.19
3	506	46	11.00
4	423	45	9.40
5	519	57	9.11

Examining the distribution of percentage of comments across ranks in terms of directionality reveals an interesting yet predictable outcome (see Table 4). The higher the rank, the more likely the student is to receive positive comments; the lower the rank, the more likely the student is to receive constructive comments. In fact, the correlation is extremely similar—a rank of "1" received an average of 60.29 percent of positive comments, while a rank of "5" received an average of 59.59 percent constructive comments. A rank of "1" received an average 27.21 percent of constructive comments, while a rank of "5" received 27.75 percent positive comments. In addition, a first place is the only rank where the positive comments dominated over the constructive comments—a domination of two-to-one. Second place rankings showed more of a balance, with constructive comments (47.85%) edging out positive comments (42.22%). A pattern emerged in neutral comments, with ranks of "1" and "5" being comparable with a high percentage, ranks of "2" and "4" comparable with the lower percentages, and a rank of "3" floating in between. However, no plausible reason could be determined for this pattern.

Table 4: All Five Interpretation Events: Distribution of Positive, Constructive and Neutral Comments According to Rank

Rank	N Comments	N Pos	N Con	N Neu	%of Pos	%of Con	%of Neu
1	544	328	148	68	60.29%	27.21%	12.50%
2	604	255	289	60	42.22%	47.85%	9.93%
3	506	178	276	52	35.18%	54.55%	10.28%
4	423	131	250	42	30.97%	59.10%	9.93%
5	519	144	309	66	27.75%	59.54%	12.72%

Note: Pos = Positive Comments
      Con = Constructive Comments
      Neu = Neutral Comments

Discussion

This content analysis of oral interpretation events provides some interesting insight into the activity of competitive individual events. The 10.38 mean of comments written on ballots in this research is consistent with results from other studies both in oral interpretation and public address. Carey and Rodier's (1987) analysis of oral interpretation ballots averaged 10.72 comments per ballot, and Jensen's (1988) study of original public address events had a mean of 10.42.

In examining the distribution of comments per event, the high and low were poetry and program oral interpretation. The lower number of comments for program oral interpretation may be due to its experien-

tial status as an individual event. Judges may not have written as many comments simply because they were not sure *what* to write. The high number of comments for poetry is more difficult to determine. Simple logic would assume that dramatic duo would have the highest number of comments, as a judge is writing for two speakers. Poetry may simply be a "favorite" event for judges on the intercollegiate circuit and thus receives greater attention through written comments.

What is more interesting than the mean number of comments per ballot is the content of those comments. The emphasis on material may seem to be a major concern on the intercollegiate forensic circuit, but a closer examination of the sub-categories from which "Material" was formed reveal that 150 of the comments were neutral in nature (primarily dealing with title, author's name, and theme) and 120 of 170 comments directed at the material selected were positive in direction-ality (i.e., "interesting story"). If these factors are taken into consider-ation, "Material" would fall to third under "Character" and "Delivery." The sub-categories of "Material" also reveal interesting facts on what are considered "touchy subjects" in competition. Author's intent and offensive language were an infrequent occurrence on ballots, only being mentioned once. The subject of literary merit was only noted four times.

The second and third most frequently mentioned categories, "Character" and "Delivery," raise other questions. The predominant dimensions composing these categories are technique-oriented. How the character acts, distinction between characters, focal points, enunci-ation, speed, volume, and movement … are all primarily related to technical training. The one sub-category distinctly separated from this issue is the thought process of characters, but this was a rare comment, appearing only 11 times. The propensity toward technique is not a new problem in oral interpretation. Colley (1983) stated, "judging [is] reduced to a matter of technique, degree of slickness" (p. 44) and the Action Caucus in Oral Interpretation in Forensic Competition (1983) reported: "We see the same sort of undesirable reading or performance behaviors repeatedly in oral interpretation competition. We see slick-ness, showiness, and emphasis on technique" (p. 54). The argument could be made that the emphasis on technique is because students must first master these features before moving on toward an internalization of the Literature. I disagree with this view. Technique should be used as *support* for understanding and relating the material—not as the primary means of conveying a selection. I align myself with Colley (1983), who feels, "the content of the message is the important thing, not the tech-niques used to deliver the content. Technical display is not art" (p. 45).

On the other end of the spectrum are those comments which received little attention, the most problematic being the little attention given to the explication of a decision. The rank order of the 19 categories illustrates that one of the main concerns for a student, the reason they receive the rank/rate they did, is the least often written comment. Without a clear explanation for a rank/rate, a student must first interpret the literature in competition, and then "interpret" the judges' comments on the ballots. The question which comes to mind is whether judges have a clear and distinct reason for the ranks/rates they give, or if it is often just a "gut reaction." The missing judge's decision is mentioned by Carey and Rodier (1987), and Jensen (1988), both noting the need for this problematic area to be addressed. Jensen (1988) says, "it is also essential that a critic's comments clearly explain ratings and rankings given to a student in order to help that participant to grow, both educationally and competitively" (p. 8), and Carey and Rodier (1987) state, "there is often no clear logical or apparent reason for the rank or rate" (p. 16). Mills (1990) argues that one potential method for clearing up the lack of explicit judging decisions is to include it as a specific instruction with its own specific area on each ballot. Whether this would prove useful is waiting for a future research program to determine.

The distribution of comments according to rank reveals that the better a speaker is, the more comments s/he is likely to receive. Judges may wish to be more conscious of this proclivity to write more for the better competitor in the round. It seems logical that the ballot and its remarks would best serve the student receiving the "5" and "6" rather than the student receiving the first or second in the round. If the pedagogical purpose of forensics is to continue, further exploration in this area is warranted to determine if potentially negative consequences are resulting from this propensity. Additional research is possible by focusing on one specific event and breaking the categories down into their basic components. Ballot content analysis may also look for regional differences in type and quantity of comments, and differences between the coach/judge and the hired judge.

This study of oral interpretation individual event ballots has attempted to determine and to highlight some of the norms and their potential problems in judging comments. While judges are writing an adequate number of comments, they also tend to be emphasizing technique over understanding and internalization. Finally, there needs to be a concentrated effort to supply students with concrete reasons for the ranks and rates they receive on ballots. The pedagogical benefits of forensics are extensive, but they can only be maintained through introspective analysis of the event. This article is one step in that direction.

References

Beloof, R. (1969). The oral reader and the future of literary studies. *The Speech Teacher, 18,* 9-12.

Berelson, B. (1952). Content analysis in communication research. *New York; Hafner Press (Macmillan Publishing).*

Carey, J., & Rodier, R. (1987). Judging the judges: a content analysis of oral interpretation ballots. Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association Convention, Boston, MA.

Dean, K. W. & Benoit, W, L. (1984). A categorical content analysis of rhetorical criticism ballots. *National Forensic Journal, 2,* 99-108.

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research.* Chicago: Aldine Publishing.

Hanson, C.T. (1988). Judging after-dinner speaking: identifying the criteria for evaluation. *National Forensic Journal,* 6, 25-34.

Harris, E. J., Jr. (1987). Rhetorical criticism: judges' expectations and contest standards. *National Forensic Journal, 5,* 21-2S.

Holloway, H. H., Allen, J., Barr, J. R., Colley, X, Keefe, C, Pearse, J. A., & St. Clair, I. M. (1983). Report on the action caucus on oral interpretation in forensics competition. *National Forensics Journal, 1,* 43-58.

Jensen, S, C. (1988).A categorical analysis of original speaking event ballots: a discussion of current trends in judging original speeches in intercollegiate forensics competition. *Perspective on individual events: Proceedings of the first developmental conference on individual events.*

Krippendorf, K. (1980). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Lewis, T. V, Williams, D. A., Keaveney, M. M., & Leigh, M. G. (1984). Evaluating oral interpretation events; a contest and festival perspectives symposium. *National Forensic Journal, 2,*19-32.

Mills, N. H. (1983). Judging standards in forensics: toward a uniform code in the 80's. *National Forensic Journal, 1,*19-31.

Mills, D. D. (1990). What should be done to improve oral interpretation events in individual events: Need to include a "reason for decision" on oral interpretation ballots. Presented at the Second Developmental Conference on Individual Events, Denver, CO.

Pratt, J. W. (1987). Judging the judges: A content analysis of ballots for original public speaking events. Presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Boston, MA.

Preston, C. T., Jr. (1983). Judging criteria for intercollegiate limited preparation speaking events. Presented at the annual meeting of the Central States Speech Association, Lincoln, NE.

Robb, M. (1950). Trends in the teaching of oral interpretation. *Western Speech, 14,* 8-11.

Ross, D. (1484). Improving judging skills through the judge workshop. *National Forensic Journal, 2,* 33-40.

Seedorf, E. H. (1952). Evaluating oral interpretation. *Western Speech, 14,* 28-30.

Verlinden, J. G. (1987). The metacritical model for judging interpretation. *National Forensic Journal,* 5, 57-66.

Wilson, G. (1950). Oral interpretation and general education. *Western Speech, 14,* 27-29.

Oral Interpretation:
What Are Students Learning?

Renea B. Gernant*

"Forensics is an educational activity primarily concerned with using an argumentative perspective in examining problems and communicating with people" (McBath, 1984). With this definition it has been debated as to whether or not oral interpretation belongs in the area of forensics education at all. Elbert (1976) and others have resoundingly declared that oral interpretation is not suited to forensic competition. These scholars believe that oral interpretation is an art and that competition encourages disrespect for the literature. Yet others believe that forensics and oral interpretation go hand in hand and that each enhances the other (e.g. Manchester, 1981; VerLinden, 1983). This study accepts the latter view. Oral interpretation can be a valuable device in which students learn to select, analyze, and defend literature as well as present believable and understandable personal interpretations of an author's work. Forensics as an educational laboratory can motivate and teach students to examine literature, its relevance and its design (Murphy, 1984). Therefore, this study examines 43 collegiate contestants' use of the interpretive study which is required in the justifications of forensics educators for including oral interpretation in forensics.

Oral Interpretation

The concern that forensics education fails to meet the goals of literary study and defense has grown up with oral interpretation in forensics. Lowrey (1958) voiced her concern that oral interpretation was focusing on the reader, not the literature nor its analysis. She wrote that oral interpretation not only had to be performed, but analyzed for meaning and understanding if it were to be a valuable learning tool. She suggested that judges should look for a student's progress toward communicating the "whole of the author's concept" rather than the performance. Yet, in spite of these early appeals, oral interpretation appears to have continued in the direction of performance, contrary to the position encouraged by Lowrey.

Rhodes (1972) suggested that the problem lay in tournament structure and requirements. He felt that students, in order to satisfy tournament requirements for themes and time limits, were choosing "easy" literature with trite but accessible themes. Students were minimizing

---

RENEA B. GERNANT is Instructor and Director of Forensics in the Department of Speech and Drama at Concordia College in Seward, NE 678434.

the authors' meanings for the sake of clearcut thematic programs which ignored literary quality but appealed to judges who wanted a compact and entertaining program.

An action caucus at the Speech Communication Association's 1982 convention reiterated a concern that students were forsaking literary study in forensic competition and thus the focus was being placed upon reading technique rather than the meaning of the literature. The caucus reported that inconsistency in judging theory and a lack of competent judges were partly to blame; however, coaches were also implicated. "Oral interpreters must be coached to focus on sharing or contributing to the collective experience of the literature with the audience, never becoming separate from that audience but remaining part of the audience for that piece of literature" (Holloway, et al., 1983). The caucus indicated that students were not being taught to view oral interpretation in this way.

A follow-up caucus at the 1983 Speech Communication Convention reinforced the discrepancy between the literary analysis needed in oral interpretation and that which occurs in forensics. While Keefe (1985) introduced a study indicating that some coaches do coach literary analysis in rehearsals, the concern that the process of in-depth oral interpretation, which includes study outside of practice, (Yordon, 1989) remained.

Pelias (1984) explored the judging issue by examining ballots from forensic competition. His study revealed that judges were indeed encouraging and rewarding students for performance technique rather than literary study. Judges were criticizing performance first, enunciation and clarity second, and literary quality last, with only 14.7% of judges' comments being made in this regard.

This trend is incongruous with the tasks of forensics and reduces the potential assets of forensics. Manchester (1981a) stated in a position paper presented at the 67th annual Speech Communication Association convention that the clearer the analysis of a piece of literature, the better chance the student has of creating a character. He stated that dramatic technique means nothing if literary study is neglected. Manchester (1981b) referred specifically to dramatic interpretation in forensics when urging instructors to push for more than a cursory understanding of literature, and stated that preserving the literature must be the primary concern when cutting for competition. He suggested that students should use the introduction to explain textual considerations and defend literature.

The idea that the introduction could be the vehicle for the development of literary argument, theory, and interpretation was addressed by Jay VerLinden (1983). Verlinden noted that interpreters should make

several critical and argumentative decisions when presenting a selection.These decisions included selecting a quality piece of literature, determining the author's intent, developing style and meaning, and using the body and voice. He agreed with Thomas Colley in suggesting that to eliminate these decisions and reduce the interpretation to skill and technique meant eliminating or at least reducing *forensic* skill. Therefore, he created a judging model called the "metacritic" in which judging decisions would be based upon how well a student states and defends claims made in the introduction. The claims would include why the piece is noteworthy, critical examination of the work and the author, and universal themes in the piece. VerLinden closed his arguments by stating that if forensics judges and educators continued to reward those who did no analysis, such literary study would not occur. These sentiments have continued through to the present. Hershey (1987) and Swarts (1988) reiterated the need for forensics educators and critics to encourage and reward students who examine and defend the rhetorical and argumentative features of interpretive study. Unfortunately, this practice is not always happening. All too often the opposite seems to be true. The implications of lack of analysis on the part of oral interpretation students for forensics education and competition are extensive. Educators must face the decision to reevaluate what constitutes forensics education and include what seems to be primarily a competitive acting event or begin to teach and judge students by the criteria used to justify oral interpretation's inclusion in the field.

Method

This study was conceived to examine student responses to questions surrounding literary study in oral interpretation: the time and work done prior to competition and concern for the author's purpose. It was assumed that students who had done a literary study of selections would be aware of the author's intent, theme(s), and the steps in examining a work for presentation. This assumption was based upon the work of scholars in oral and written literary interpretation (Booth, 1988; Lowrey, 1958; Manchester, 1981; VerLinden, 1983; Yordon, 1989).

Subjects

Students were asked during the first preliminary round of program of interpretation, poetry and prose at a large, midwestern state tournament to complete a survey for a research project. Forty-three out of 175 surveys were returned.

The students were from schools ranging from student populations of 10,000 or more to less than 1,200. The breakdown of respondents was as follows: 18 responses from schools of more than 10,000, three

responses from schools of 3,000 to 10,000, nine responses from schools of 1,200 to 3,000, and 13 responses from schools of less than 1,200.

Sixteen of these students had taken no classroom instruction in oral interpretation. Ten of the students had taken high school oral interpretation or one lower level college course in oral interpretation. Seventeen of the students had taken two or more semesters of collegiate instruction in oral interpretation.

Procedure

Students were asked to complete a survey with the following questions:

1) What is the approximate size of your student body?
2) Have you taken a formal class in oral interpretation? If so, please indicate at what level (high school or college; introductory, intermediate, or advanced).
3) In general, how do you select cuttings for this event?
4) How did you select or find the piece(s) on which you are now working?
5) Prior to your first verbal rehearsal, what did you do to prepare this selection for competition?
6) In terms of hours, how long have you worked on this selection OUTSIDE of rehearsal?
7) If you were to explain the steps in doing oral interpretation to a novice, what would they be?
8) Do you feel that your interpretation of this literature would be similar or the same as the author's would be? Why or why not?

After completing the surveys, students were asked to fold and return the survey to the judge who then returned the surveys along with ballots to the tab room. Responses were initially divided into groups containing responses considered to indicate some literary study and those which did not indicate literary study. Responses were also examined to determine any apparent association between school size and literary study or having had coursework in oral interpretation and literary study.

Results

In response to the questions, "In general, how do you select cuttings for this event?" and, "How did you select or find the selection on which you are now working?" students indicated that they most often find pieces by reading, paging through literature or by recommendations of others. Of the respondents giving other responses, five chose selections previously rehearsed as plays, three were given selections already cut by coaches, three chose selections they were familiar with

from other contests and two responded that they found selections in scene books or by randomly reading parts of book chapters.

Prior to the first verbal rehearsal, respondents indicated the following preparation of pieces. Eleven students noted that they had cut selections for time. Eighteen students read their pieces silently. Twelve students worked to memorize pieces. Five students had followed conventions such as creating script books or manuscripts. Four students had done nothing prior to rehearsal. One student stated that there was nothing to do, saying, "My coach did all the analytical stuff and marked my script." Seven students noted having done various forms of literary analysis; e.g. marked script, studied characters, researched author, and/or discovered poetic devices.

In terms of hours, students were asked about the time spent preparing their selections outside of rehearsal. The lowest figure was given by a student who indicated that he or she had not touched the selection outside of rehearsals with his or her coach. Fourteen students reported two to three hours of outside work. Ten students reported spending seven to ten hours. Six students reported 10 to 20 hours. Seven students estimated over 20 hours of work. Six students did not respond. Of the seven students who had indicated various forms of analysis, five reported spending 20 or more hours on their presentations outside of rehearsal.

When asked what the steps are in doing an oral interpretation, eight students responded, "Don't know," or "No idea." Sixteen students included little or no analytical work; e.g. "find something," "do it," "feel it," "practice," and "read and enjoy." Responses to the question which indicated traditional kinds of literary analyses were categorized by type. Eighteen students included one type of analytical step. Five students suggested knowing or becoming the character. Four students included finding the meanings or themes of the pieces. Five students included cutting for completeness (as well as time). Three students included learning and delivering the author's purpose in their steps. One student also included study of literary form and poetic devices.

The final question asked whether or not the students felt that their interpretations were the same or similar to what the author's would be and why. Answers were divided into positive and negative responses. Eighteen students indicated that they felt their interpretation would be close to or agree with the author's interpretation. Three of those eighteen stated no reason. Eight said they had done some research to verify the author's meaning. The remaining five made these replies: "It's light-hearted like I am;" "There isn't much disagreement on how to do this piece;" "Accents and cutting are accurate to [the] script;" "I

chose funny poems and I do them funny"; "It's like my life." Twelve students were unsure if they were interpreting the piece such as the author would, and nine of those indicated that they didn't know the author's intent. Seven students indicated that it didn't matter what the author's intent was. Four of the seven believed knowledge of the author's intent wasn't needed for oral interpretation; two of the seven believed this knowledge wasn't necessary because they weren't the author, and one stated, "Knowing the author's meaning is not the purpose of oral interpretation; it is how you feel about it." Six students replied that they did not have the same or similar interpretations for the following reasons: "No one could do what the author intended;" "The author wrote the piece; therefore, he is an author and not an inter- preter;" "No one knows what any author means, and I wasn't there and I do not know who they actually are;" "Each person has a thought as to what they mean;" and "I don't like to do it the same way as the author."

Discussion

While some students do perform some kind of literary analysis, this study indicates that that analysis is neither thorough nor as complete as possible. Students may feel that analytical work is not important or intended as part of the forensics activity.

This study reiterates the concern that students are not actively pursuing literary study as a part of oral interpretation of literature in forensics. Students are finding selections without having read the entire literary work, and in this study three of 43 students were handed cuttings by coaches. These students miss a valuable opportunity to discover how their cuttings reflect the whole piece of literature.

Few students are doing research outside of rehearsals, although those who do seem to do a great deal. A large number of students have no idea what the steps in preparing an oral interpretation are and fail to include such basic ideas as theme and knowledge of author's intent in the their outlines of interpretive steps. While one can argue that not being able to identify these steps doesn't mean they didn't take them, this does raise the concern that students haven't thought through the goals of oral interpretation nor have they carefully considered why and what they are doing in their interpretations.

Perhaps one of the most disconcerting results of this study is the number of students who do not know or care what the author intended by selections, nor do these students feel it is important to the interpre- tive event to attempt to share the author's meaning. While a student may validly argue that their text can stand alone, responses indicated an ignorance and a misunderstanding of the goal and justification for interpretation in forensics. Student comments "I only touch it at tour-

naments," "My instructor thought these poems have some meaning so he gave them to me," "My instructor gives me suggestions about the author that I usually hate and then I do it my way," "I haven't a clue [to author's intent], and I never really thought about it," reflect a failure in forensics education.

Perhaps these misconceptions can be blamed in part on judging practices. As one student put it, "The author was not competing." Maybe the way judges reward and encourage students does create this attitude. However, the problem can't be attributed solely to judging practice. Repeatedly scholars have reiterated the ideals for forensics interpretation and put down beginning guidelines for judges (Holloway, et.al., 1983; Murphy, 1984; VerLinden, 1983). Repeatedly these guidelines have been ignored by tournament directors, judges, and coaches. It may be that the problem needs to be approached not from what happens at the tournament, but from what happens before the student ever begins.

For example, Murphy (1984) suggests these resolutions for forensics judging standards in oral interpretation:

1. The interpreter's program should communicate an apparent purpose/justification for the literature selected.
2. The interpreter's program should communicate a motivational link (relevance factor) between the selection and the audience.
3. The interpreter's program should maintain the ethical integrity of the literature.
4. The interpreter's program should display an understanding of thematic development and a sense of continuity in the presentation.
5. The interpreter's program should be delivered using appropriate vocal and physical presentational skills which enhance rather than detract from the literature. (90)

If these are the criteria on which a student should be judged in the forensics laboratory, then these are the criteria which need to be emphasized and taught in the forensics classroom before the tournament ever begins.

Students need to be told and taught to pursue the goals of interpretation in advance. Writing is an act of interpretation (Booth, 1988). Oral interpreters do have a responsibility to know and consider the author's intent, not just how one "feels" about a selection. Students cannot be led into believing that the literary study doesn't matter, even if at times it seems as if judges aren't looking for it.

Coaches must not give students the selections or the analyses. Just as writing a speech for a student is ethically questionable, so is eliminat-

ing a students chance to discover the literature and what it means. In addition, forensics educators should strive to insure that students are reading and analyzing selections entirely and that cuttings are representative of the whole.

Students must be required to do complete literary studies of pieces being prepared for competition. The action caucus report (Holloway, et al., 1983) suggested that perhaps students could be required to turn manuscripts in to tournaments in advance for judges to consider and examine for analyses. While this may not be practical, forensics educators should require students to complete analysis as part of forensics participation, just as debaters prepare briefs and public speakers create their manuscripts.

Forensics educators should consider approaching the writing of introductions as a presentation of literary claims (Swarts, 1988; VerLinden, 1983) and encourage inclusion of criticism and justification in the introduction. This would be an asset to judges and would enable competitors to discover reasons for performance choices and interpretations.

In closing, since this study was not equipped to measure adequately the relationships between size of school and the use of analysis, nor did there appear to be a relationship between having taken an oral interpretation class and doing literary analysis, further research is warranted. In addition, since this study was conducted at only one state tournament, this kind of study should be repeated on a more extensive basis such as across tournaments or at a national tournament in order to validate its results. Likewise, further structuring of questions may yield more precise results. Oral interpretation is a popular forensic event with tremendous potential as an argumentative, communicative and decision-making tool. Scholars (e.g. Holloway, et al., 1983; Murphy 1984) have studied ways by which those criteria could be judged and taught. Yet, those ideals have not reached students. The link between the scholarship and the students must be forensics educators who demand that both judges and students are aware of and use what has been written and debated in order to adhere to the rationale and the reasoning for forensics education of any kind.

References

Booth, W. (1983). The *rhetoric of fiction.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Elbert, K. (1976). A half century of collegiate oral interpretation festival going. *Communication Education* , *75,* 127-131.

Holloway, H., Allen, J., Barr, J., Colley, T., Keefe, C, Peares, J., & St. Clair, J, (1982). Report on an action caucus on oral interpretation in forensics competition, *National Forensic Journal, 1,* 43-58.

Holloway, H. Skinner, J., Matthis, J., Keefe, C, and Allen, J. (1986). Oral interpretation in forensics competition: Representative papers. *National Forensic Journal, 1,* 53-74.

Hershey, L. (1987). Arguing literature: some suggestions for the coaching and judging of the performance of literature in individual events competition. *The Forensic, 73,* 13-15.

Keefe, C. (1985). Verbal interactions in coaching the oral interpretation of poetry. *National Forensic Journal, 1,* 55-69.

Lowrey, Sara. (1958). Preparing students in oral interpretation for contests, *Southern Journal of Speech, 4,* 204-210.

Manchester, B. *(19Sla)Judging dramatic interpretation: textual considerations.* Unpublished paper presented at the 67th annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association. Anaheim, CA.

Manchester, B. (1981b). *The value of forensic competition for oral interpretation students.* Unpublished paper presented at the 67th annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association. Anaheim, CA.

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

Murphy, J. (1984). Individual events. In D. Parson *(Ed.) American forensics in perspective* (pp. 87-93). Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association.

Pelias, R. (1984). Evaluating interpretation events on the forensics circuit. *Journal of the American Forensics Association, 20, HA-l'iQ.*

Rhodes, J. (1972). The selection of materials for contests in oral interpretation. *Journal of the Americsn Forensics Association, 8,* 135-138.

Swarts, V (1988). The function of the introduction in competitive oral interpretation. *National Forensic Journal, 6,* 35-42.

VerUnden, J. (1983). The metacritical model for judging interpretation events. *National Forensic Journal, 2,* 57-66.

Yordon, J. (1989). *Roles in interpretation.* Dubuque, IA; W.C. Brown.

Prima Facie
Old Distinctions / New Applications

Stephen C. Wood and Jean M. DeWitt*

Prima facie is a concept used by the related fields of law and academic debate. While both fields are rooted in a common corpus of argumentation theory, they utilize *prima facie* differently. In law, *prima facie* is a broad-based concept that refers to cases, arguments, and evidence. Currently, in academic debate, *prima facie* is more narrowly utilized, usually referring to affirmative cases only. The thesis of this research posits that academic debate will be enriched by a fuller application of *prima facie* as a concept. Specifically, while *prima facie* is currently limited to affirmative cases in academic debate, we would extend the concept to negative cases, to affirmative and negative arguments, and to evidence. The advantage of this conceptual expansion is the availability of an identifiable standard for cases, arguments, and evidence used in academic debate.

In the history of academic debate, few authors acknowledge a *prima facie* concept broader than a standard for the affirmative case. The earliest definition of *prima facie* in academic debate we found was in Scales, Laycock and O'Neill (1917), who defined it as "the case which is of sufficient strength to win if not refuted" (p. 86). Though abandoned by later authors, Laycock, Scales, and O'Neill also included the negative case in the umbra of *prima facie:* "It is important that both sides present *prima facie* cases" (p. 89). Since 1917, many definitions of *prima facie* have been offered by theorists of argumentation and debate but usually they have been limited to affirmative cases and have not included negative cases (as did Laycock, *et al.,)* individual arguments or evidence. (See Bartanen and Frank, 1991, Brock, 1973; Church and Wilbanks 1986; Eisenberg and Ilardo, 1980; Freeley, 1986; Herrick, 1991 Jensen, 1981; Keefe, 1982; Kruger, 1960; McBath, 1963; Sanders, 1983; Sayer, 1980; Sheckels, 1984; Sproule, 1980; Windes and Hastings, 1965; Wood and Midgley, 1989, and Ziegelmueller, et al., 1990).[1] *Prima facie* has become "a ritualistic synonym for 'good case'" (Scott, 1960, p. 34).

In the field of legal theory, however, *prima facie* is not a ritualistic synonym for a good case but rather a broad-based concept that applies to cases, arguments, and evidence. Black (1979), for example, defines *prima facie* as: "At first sight; on the first appearance; on the face of it; so

STEPHEN C. WOOD is Associate Professor in the Speech Communication Department at the University of Rhode Island, Kingston, RI 02881; JEAN M. DEWITT is Assistant Professor in the Speech Communication Department at the University of Houston-Downtown, Houston, TX 77380.

far as can be judged from the first disclosure; presumably; a fact presumed to be true unless disproved by some evidence to the contrary" (p. 1071). Defining *prima facie* on the case level, Black cites three defining precedents; one definition subsumes the other two and suggests that"... evidence sufficient to render reasonable a conclusion in favor of [the] allegation... [the] plaintiff's evidence would reasonably allow [for the] conclusion no evidence to rebut it" (p. 1071). *The Oxford English Dictionary* defines *prima facie* evidence as part of a *prima facie* case: "*Prima facie* case ... [is] a case resting on *prima facie* evidence" (p. 1357). *Burton's Legal Thesaurus* defines *prima facie* evidence as a term that applies to case, claim, evidence, negligence and proof (Burton, 1980, p. 405). *Ballentine's Law Dictionary* defines *prima facie* evidence as "adequate as it appears, without more" (Anderson, p. 987). Even a cursory examination of *prima facie* in law reveals a much broader application of the term than commonly found in academic debate. Based on a synthesis of the legal and academic definitions, we offer the following definition of *prima facie:*

> A CASE, ARGUMENT, OR EVIDENCE THAT IS REASONABLE, LOGICALLY COMPLETE AND COMPELLING IN THE FIRST PRESENTATION, THAT, ABSENT A *PRIMA FACIE* REJOINER, REMAINS COMPELLING.

Conceptual Interaction

Prima facie is commonly associated with burden of proof and presumption in academic debate. Windes and Hastings (1965) discuss *prima facie* in light of burden of proof: "In order to discharge this burden of proof, an affirmative must present a *prima facie* case..." (p. 74) which echoes McBath's (1963) discussion. The affirmative can satisfactorily discharge its burden of proof by establishing a *prima facie* case" (p. 107). Rieke and Sillars (1984) suggest that a *"prima facie* case is one that meets the demands of the burden of proof by offering evidence in support of each of the essential elements of the question at hand" (pp. 240-241). Sanders separates burden of proof from *prima facie* because "there are different approaches as to what makes a case *prima facie* in nature" (p. 44).

The burden of proof must be met initially to overcome the presumption against change. Whately's seminal work on presumption, first published in 1828, sets a standard for the concept that is sometimes confused by those involved in academic debate:

> According to the most correct use of the term, a "Presumption" in favor of any supposition, means not... a preponderance of probability in its favor but, such a *preoccupation* of the ground, as implies that it must stand good till some sufficient reason is adduced against it;... (p. 147).

The confusion often centers around de facto assignment of presumption to the negative team labeled "artificial presumption,"

(Bryden, 1986, p. 16). The initial assignment of presumption is a product of the structure of a resolution, not some inherent quality of the concept (Zeuschner and Hill, 1981, p. 22). Whately (1861) argues for a presumption that is not preassigned and is flexible: "It is observed, that a Presumption may be *rebutted* by an opposite Presumption, so as to shift the Burden of proof to the other side..." (p. 148). If the resolution to be debated is a question of policy and is so worded that the affirmative is proposing a change in the status quo, then initially presumption may rest with the negative. In order to be reasonably persuasive, the affirmative must present a case that shifts the presumption.

Thus, *prima facie,* burden of proof and presumption are conceptually entwined. Both teams may claim presumption, both teams may charge the other with a burden of proof. This duality need not be bothersome—with an understanding of *prima facie* as a broad-based concept, it matters little which team claims presumption or charges the other with the burden of proof. What becomes transcendently important is which case, arguments and evidence, have been reasonably complete and compelling.

Policy Debate

With resolutions of policy, the relationship of these concepts is fairly clear and predictable (largely due to the predictable structure of the resolution). Thus, the operationalization of *prima facie* case requirements (stock issues) change little. The danger is that the operationalization will be confused with the concept. *Prima facie* conceptually transcends any set of stock issues.

Eisenberg and Ilardo (1980) typify a policy perspective on the criteria for *prima facie.* They suggest that discovering the stock issues and then fulfilling those stock issues constitutes *& prima facie* case. In debate theory, a *prima facie* case implies the following: (1) a need exists and can be demonstrated, (2) the existing problem cannot be solved within the status quo, and (3) the affirmative plan is workable and will meet the need (p.30).

Sproule's (1980) analysis of *prima facie* argues that we test *aprima facie* case by the "sufficiency of proof" supporting the "six necessary attributes of a *prima facie* case" (p. 373). Sproule's stock issues include: establish that a disparity exists, is significant, and inherent; and provide a plan that removes the disparity, is workable, and not disadvantageous. Certainly, any affirmative case on a policy topic fulfilling Sproule's stock issues would be viewed as *prima facie* albeit limited to policy resolutions, and affirmative case structure.

Sheckels (1984) suggests a fairly common set of stock issues which he claims must be met in order to fulfill the *prima facie* requirements.

These stock issues include topicality, significance, inherency, plan and solvency. He acknowledges that these stock issues are a product of policy resolutions "when the stock issues gave rise to a standard affirmative case structure" (p. 64).

Ziegelmueller, *et al.,* (1990) continue with a traditional perspective on *prima facie. Prima facie* is a unifying concept that "allows us to relate the ideas of presumption, burden of proof and issues:" (p. 22). But the rigidity of policy debate theory in contrast to argumentation theory, persists. The burden of proof is an example: "The burden of proof always resides with the advocate of change; it never shifts during the controversy" (p. 20). While such a position may be consonant with traditional debate theory on issues of policy, it is not consistent with the larger concept of a dynamic presumption.

As the case structure in policy debates shifted, the operating mode for *prima facie* shifted correspondingly. Brock, Chesebro, Cragan, and Klumpp (1973) identify four *prima facie* obligations in a policy debate using a comparative advantages approach. These obligations include prediction, significance, cost/benefit, and uniqueness. To fulfill the prediction obligation, "the affirmative must demonstrate that the present system, with the inclusion of the debate resolution, will make more progress toward the stated goals of society, than without it" (p. 105). To achieve the significance obligation, "the progress predicted in the advantages must be demonstrated to be quantitatively and/or qualitatively significant..." (p. 105). To meet the cost-benefit obligation the affirmative case must make more "progress toward goals of society with less expense than the present system" (p. 105). Finally, to achieve uniqueness, "the affirmative must be able to demonstrate that no alternative system secures the degree of improvement at the costs embodied in the affirmative proposal" (p. 105).

The Brock *et al.,* (1973) standard for *prima facie* in the comparative advantages case is rigorous, but their standard seems to confuse *prima facie* as a concept with their notion of an ideal case. For example, few people would expect an affirmative case to explore all "alternative systems" before considering the case reasonably complete. However, it does illustrate the need to reconceptualize *prima facie* depending on types of claims being brought to a resolution.

Value Debate

With the increasing frequency of value resolutions in collegiate debate, the relationship among burden of proof, presumption, and a *prima facie* case requirements is less clear. While Whately (1828,1963) was sure that a "moderate portion of common-sense will enable anyone to perceive . . . on which side the Presumption lies . . ." (p. 113),

Zeuschner and Hill (1981) note that "a heated argument has ensued between debate scholars over where presumption exists, if indeed it does at all in a value debate" (p. 22).

A direct comparison with policy debate demonstrates the problem of confusing how a concept can be confused with practice. First, in a value resolution, the affirmative may not be advocating a change in the *status quo.* In fact, the resolution may be so worded that the affirmative is actually arguing that the values of the status quo are superior to another set of values. There is, then, no presumption to overcome; the presumptive ground is already held by the affirmative. If there is no presumption to overcome, then what burden of proof must be assumed to warrant the adoption of the resolution? The affirmative cannot bypass its responsibility to prove what it asserts, but the traditional application of concepts developed for policy debate, especially in terms of what constitutes *A prima facie* case, do not necessarily cross over to value debate.

When Sheckels (1984) argues that certain value topics need to meet the stock issues of topicality, significance, inherency, and solvency in order to be *prima facie,* he is imposing fixed criteria on the concept. The criteria should not be confused with concept; those stock issues may be sufficient to prove *prima facie* case in some circumstances but other standards are possible. What actually constitutes a *prima facie* case is debatable.

Warnick, for example, defines *prima facie* case in arguing value propositions as "one that clearly establishes a set of values and applies them to the evaluatum" (p. 118). While Freeley (1986) suggests certain stock issues for policy resolutions (inherency, significance, plan with solvency, workability, advantages), in his most current edition he offers value obligations which include: requirement to prove the best definitions), best criterion, application, inherency (sometimes), and burden of communication. Importantly, Freeley does not define these issues as stock issues constituting a *prima facie* case, but rather they seem to be tentative considerations on what constitutes a reasonably complete case (p. 171-174).

The use of *prima facie* in academic debate is limited. Given the current importance of value resolution debate and the evolving nature of policy resolution debate, the concept of *prima facie* needs to be more than a "ritualistic synonym for a good case" (Scott, 1960, p.34).

Extended Standards: Case

The current use of *prima facie* in academic debate is limited to the affirmative case. In law, the prosecution must meet the *prima facie* burden concerning the case at hand. That is, if the case is incomplete or

insufficient to warrant a shift of the presumption of innocence, then the prosecution has failed to fulfill the *prima facie* obligation. The reference point in such situations is the case as a whole.

Similarly, in academic debate, the first affirmative constructive speaker assumes an initial *prima facie* case burden. Here, as in the courtroom, the focus is on the affirmative case. A fundamental question for the negative team to raise in response to the affirmative case is, does the case warrant the resolution?

The current practice of limiting *prima facie* to just a modifier of the affirmative case is not self evident. O'Neill and McBurney (1932) suggest that "it is important that both sides present *prima facie* cases" (p. 89). The negative case should be held to a *prima facie* standard. Negative cases, that is a collection of arguments raised by the negative during the debate that independently warrant the rejection of the resolution, are commonplace and often deciding factors in academic debate. As such, the application of A *prima facie* standard to the negative case provides the affirmative with a useful strategic tool. In policy debate, the negative case might be manifested in a counter-plan and in non-policy debate the negative case might be manifested in the "off-case." In either case, the affirmative response arsenal should include the global question of *prima faciality.*

Extended Standards: Arguments

The concept of being reasonably complete is a useful standard to apply to individual arguments. They should be convincing and compel the claim if the argument is not refuted. Arguments that consist of an assertion of evidence and a claim, or just a claim, would be easily challenged under the application of a *prima facie* argument standard. In a court of law, the defense is not obliged to respond substantively to a prosecutor who fails to meet the *prima facie* case burden. Similarly, in a debate, the negative is not obliged to respond substantively to an affirmative which fails to meet the *prima facie* case burden. Freeley's (1961) first edition points out that "the negative need not even reply to the affirmative until the affirmative has established a *prima facie* case" (p. 19). A similar standard should exist on the argument level. If an argument fails to meet a *prima facie* standard, then that failure should be sufficient ground on which to reject the argument. No burden of rejoiner or rebuttal need exist on the substantive level. On a purely procedural level, the arguments failing to meet a *prima facie* standard can be rejected.

What constitutes a *prima facie* argument? While the standard of "reasonably complete and compelling" is extremely subjective, placing a prescriptive standard on what constitutes a *prima facie* argument

would be counterproductive. Tests of logic, deductive or inductive, could be used to determine the reasonable adequacy of an argument (see Rowland 1984 and Ulrich 1984). If an inductive argument is used fallaciously, then applying the standard of that fallacy could be used as a reflection of critical thinking.

The Toulmin (1979) model suggests that there are six elements in an argument: claim, warrant, backing (of the warrant), data (or the assertion of data), rebuttal, and qualifier (p. 25-27). Extracting from the Toulmin model, a minimum criteria could be established for a *prima facie* argument. For example, a team could suggest that an argument must have a stated claim, warrant and data to be *prima facie* (Rowland, 1984; and Wood and Midgley, 1989, pp. 111-125). Thus, in subsequent speeches, if the warrant is challenged, the backing could be supplied while not being a part of the *prima facie* requirement of that argument. Or, if an argument consisted of only a claim and assertion of data, then that argument would be susceptible to a charge of not being *prima facie.*

Some arguments expressed in debate rounds suggest by their structure that the presentation of data and claim represents a sufficient and reasonable standard. Clearly that standard could be challenged as inadequate, but if that standard is tacitly accepted, then the opposition foregoes the opportunity to challenge the argument on procedural grounds. The nature of what constitutes a *prima facie* argument is debatable and is a proper subject of debate. Standards concerning the minimal elements of an argument, such as those mentioned above, need to be established early in the debate and made an overt and integral element of the process.

Extended Standards: Evidence

Evidence used to support an argument can also be subjected to a *prima facie* standard. A minimal evidentiary standard could be established and evidence introduced that failed to meet that standard could be refuted on procedural grounds. The basis of an argument can be successfully challenged if the other team demonstrates that the standards of evidence have not been met.

There are two levels from which a standard for evidence can evolve: a presumptive evidentiary standard, and a nonpresumptive evidentiary standard. The presumptive evidentiary standard is the tacit standard which reflects the general thinking of the debate community—a consensus of the literature standard. This standard may be invoked by the first negative, for example, to demonstrate that by virtually anyone's standard of evidence, the affirmative team has failed to meet that standard. Failure to meet the presumptive standard for evidence represents a failure at the *prima facie* level.

Second, the nonpressumptive standard is a specific criterion on which to judge the prima faciality of evidence. These standards may or may not be self evident. For example, a team may argue that while comprehensibility does not seem to be a presumptive standard for evidence in many debates, such a standard can be justified and evidence can be tested against that standard.

What constitutes *prima facie* evidence is subjective; academic debate has traditions of evidence but no rules of evidence. Certain expectations (presumptive standards) may exist and may include reasonably complete citations, the relevancy and the accuracy of the evidence. Less presumptive standards include a comprehensible presentation of the substance of the evidence and impact analysis. In the absence of evidentiary rules, academic debate is susceptible to abuses of a reasonable and compelling standard. The problem is exacerbated by some debater's predilection to allow highly truncated citations, incomprehensible presentations of the substance of the evidence and little or no analysis linking the evidence to the claim.

With a *prima facie* evidentiary standard, the issues of citation, comprehensibility, and analysis can become viable procedural issues. A team can argue that it is not their responsibility nor the judges to link the evidence to the claim and that any failure to do so represents grounds on which to reject that evidence. A team can argue that that which is incomprehensible cannot be evaluated substantively and on those grounds should be rejected. A team can argue that the citation is not complete enough for reasonable and compelling adherence to the evidence and on those grounds should be rejected. Teams who believe that comprehensibility should not be part of a *prima facie* criteria can so argue.

Implications for Extended Standards

On the case level, if an affirmative teams fails to present a *prima facie* case in the first affirmative constructive, then the negative is under no obligation to allow the completion of the *prima facie* burden in any subsequent affirmative speech. That is, if the case fails at the first affirmative constructive level, it fails absolutely. If the negative case (i.e., the off-case in a value debate) is not *prima facie* then the affirmative is under no responsibility to respond at any level beyond procedural arguments.

Likewise, if an argument when first introduced, is not *prima facie,* then the opposition (affirmative or negative) is under no obligation to allow the argument to become *prima facie* in subsequent speeches. Finally, if the evidence used to support an argument is not *prima facie,* then there is no attendant obligation to allow subsequent speakers the

opportunity to correct the error. Cases, arguments, and evidence that are not reasonably complete and compelling on first view, fail absolutely—or so it can be argued.

A careful and critical application of *prima facie* as a concept that extends, not only to the affirmative case but to any case, argument, or evidence, would have a powerful and positive impact on academic debate. However, the acceptance of this extended standard is not without attendant risks. One of the risks associated with this reconceptualization is abuse by overuse. *Prima facie* is not an argumentative club with which to beat an opponent, unless that opponent has clearly violated *prima facie* standards. As with other procedural arguments such as topicality, it should not be raised merely for exercise. Debaters sometimes trivialize topicality by raising it against cases that are obviously central to the resolution. *Prima facie* can also be trivialized by indiscriminate use. *Prima facie* standards are only a part of a larger argumentative arsenal from which the appropriate weapons should be selected based on the dynamics of each debate.

Another attendant risk is that *prima facie* presses will be used to circumvent clash or the burden of proof. Brydon (1986) provides an example of a hypothetical first affirmative argument *using prima facie* as a ruse to avoid its initial burden of proof: "Since we support the status quo, and therefore have presumption, it is incumbent upon the negative to present a *prima facie* case as to why we should abandon the status quo. Until they present such a case, you must support the affirmative" (p. 17-18). By reassessing *prima facie* on the case level to extend to any set of arguments for or against a resolution, such an argument will remain hypothetical.

The procedural charge of being *non-prima facie* should not be used as a ruse to avoid clash or the burden of proof. Instead, such a strategy, if appropriate, can pressure the opposition to present its arguments and evidence, as well as its case, in a reasonable and compelling manner or risk the argument or evidence being rejected on *prima facie* grounds. Further, instead of minimizing clash, it can direct clash to the proper ground—procedural first, substantive second.

The risk of abuse by either overuse or as a device to circumvent clash, is outweighed by the positive ramifications. The setting of minimum standards for cases, arguments, and evidence and using those standards as critical, procedural, decisionable issues can raise the standards of academic debate. With a greater emphasis on quality and appropriate levels of quantity, the use of evidence can become more critical, and arguments will be less prone to incomplete development.

One reason the overall quality of debate can be helped by the use of an extended *prima facie* standard is that such standards have mirrorlike

qualities. A standard for evidence established in the first affirmative constructive applies to the affirmative team with the same weight with which they apply it to the negative team. The negative could not, for example, argue for a *prima facie* standard on the argument or evidentiary level without that standard applying equally to their arguments. In order to hold their opponents to a high argumentative standard, a team must be willing to accept that standard for their cases, arguments and evidence.

The extended *prima facie* standard provides debaters with an additional strategy against spread argumentation. If a criteria for arguments and evidence is established early in the round, then that criteria maybe applied against spread arguments on a procedural level. Spread arguments are particularly susceptible to this kind of response. Often, spread arguments are designed to win on the substantive level by circumventing standards of good argumentation and reasonable use of evidence. If a fifteen point spread is attacked on the *prima facie* level, then it can be dispatched with greater efficiency.

A hierarchy of argumentation strategy evolves. That is, on the case level, procedural arguments should be raised before developing substantive case responses. On the argument and evidentiary levels, the same sequence holds—procedural issues first then, as appropriate, substantive responses.

Finally, the frequency with which *prima facie* arguments will be relevant may be reduced over time (see Markgraf, 1968, p. 367). As the standards for cases, arguments and evidence are raised, the debaters will respond accordingly and the argumentation will be predominately on substantive, not procedural issues. This shift may take time and the viability of procedural arguments will always be present. Currently used as a manifestation of stock issues, burden of proof and presumption, *prima facie* is limited in debate. If we extend the standard of reasonably complete and compelling to arguments, evidence, and affirmative and negative cases, then academic debate becomes stronger on both pedagogical and competitive grounds.

Notes

[1]Since 1917, many definitions of a *prima facie* case have been offered by theorists of argumentation and debate. A representative collection of key phrases characterizing *prima facie* includes:

> Rationally sufficient; complete; overcomes presumption; appears to prove the resolution; good and sufficient reason; logically self-sufficient; convince a reasonable and prudent person; logically adequate; logical and convincing arguments; the essential elements . . . with evidentiary support; sufficiently strong to uphold the burden of proof; reasonable and compelling; logically complete if it were not attacked; the minimum which the affirmative must prove; and sufficient to establish the merits of a proposition.

The early works of Baker (1902), Laycock and Scales (1904), Perry (1906) and Foster (1908) do not mention *prima facie.* In O'Neill, Laycock and Scales (1917) edition and Foster (1932), *prima facie* was included. O'Neill consistently included *prima facie* in his works (1917, 1920 and 1932). Eubank and Auer (1941), Nichols (1941) and Musgrave (1945) omit any mention of *prima facie.* "Not all argumentation texts use the term and most of those... give definitions which are vague and probably circular" (Scott, 1960, p. 369). By the 1960s, most textbooks on argumentation and debate included some treatment of *prima facie.* Contemporary textbooks which emphasize argumentation tend to omit any treatment of *prima facie,* (see Crable, 1976; Eisenberg and Ilardo, 1972; Fogelin, 1978; Huber, 1963; Rottenberg, 1985; Ruby and Yarber, 1974).

Works Cited

Anderson, W. S. (ed.) (1969). *Ballentine 's law dictionary.* NY: The Lawyers Co-Operative.

Baker, G. P. (1902). *The principles of argumentation.* NY: Ginn and Co.

Bartanen, M.D. and Frank, D.A. (1991). *Debating values.* Scottsdale, AZ: Gorsuch Scarisbrick.

Black, H. C. (ed.) (1979). *Black's law dictionary* (5th). NY: West Publishing.

Brock, B. L., Chesebro, J.W., Cragan, J.F., & Klumpp, J.F. (1973). *Public policy decision-making: Systems analysis and comparative advantages debate.* NY: Harper & Row.

Byrdon, S.R. (1986). "Presumption in non-policy debate: In search of a paradigm." *Journal of the American Forensic Association, 23,* 15-22.

Burton, W.C. (ed) (1980). *Legal thesaurus.* NY: Macmillan.

Church, R.T. (1986). "On being *'prima facie'*—an application to non-policy argument." *CEDA Yearbook, 7,* 29-35.

Church, R.T., and Wilbanks, C. (1986). *Values and policies in controversy: An introduction to argument and debate.* Scottsdale, AZ: Gorsuch Scarisbrick.

Crable, R.E. (1976). *Argumentation as communication.* Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill.

Dick, R.C. (1971). *Argumentation and rational debating.* Dubuque, IA: Wm. C. Brown.

Ehninger, D. and Brockriede, W. (1978). *Decision by debate.* (2nd Ed.)., NY: Harper & Row.

Eisenberg, A.M. and Ilargo, J.A. (1980). *Argument: A guide to formal and informal debate* (2nd)., Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Ewbank, H.L. and Auer, J.J. (1951). *Discussion and debate.* NY: F.S. Crofts. (2nd), NY: Appleton, Century, Crofts.

Fogelin, R.J. (1978). *Understanding arguments.* NY: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Foster, W.T. (1908, rev'd 1932). *Argumentation and debate.* NY: Houghton, Mifflin.

Freeley, A.J. (1961). *Argumentation and debate: Rational* decision making. San Francisco: Wadsworth. Revised *sub nom.* (1986) *Argumentation & debate: Critical thinking for reasoned decision making* (6th). Belmont: Wadsworth.

Gilmer, W. (ed.) (1986). *The law dictionary.* NY: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Huber, R.B. (1963). *Influencing through speech.* NY: David McKay.

Herrick, J.A. (1991). *Critical thinking: An analysis of arguments.* Scottsdale, AZ: Gorsuch Scarisbrick.

Jensen, J.V. (1981). *Argumentation: Reasoning in communication.* NY: D. VanNostrand.

Keefe, C, Harte, T.B. and Norton, L.E. (eds.) (1982). *Introduction to debate.* NY: Macmillan.

Kruger, A.N. (1968). *Counterpoint: Debates about debate.* Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press.

Kruger, A.N. (1960). *Modern debate: Its logic and strategy.* NY: McGraw-Hill.

Laycock, C. and Scales, R.L. (1904). *Argumentation and debate.* NY: Macmillan.

Markgraf, B. "The *prima facie* case: A modest proposal." *Speaker Gavel, 1,* 27-28. (Reprint, Kruger, 1968).

McBath, J.H. (ed.) (1963). *Argumentation and debate: Principles and practices.* NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

McBurney, N.H. and Mills, G.E. (1964). *Argumentation and debate: Techniques of a free society* (2nd Ed.) NY: Macmillan.

Mills, G.E. (1964). *Reasoning in controversy.* Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Musgrave, G.M. (1957). *Competitive debate, rules and techniques* (3rd Ed.) NY: H.W. Wilson.

Nichob, A. (1941). *Discussion and debate.* NY: Harcourt, Brace, and Co.

O'Neill, J.M., Laycock, C, and Scales, R.L (1917). *Argumentation and debate.* NY: Macmillan.

O'Neill, J.M. (1920). *A manual of debate and oral discussion.* NY: The Century Co.

O'Neill, J.M., and McBurney, J.H. (1932). *The working principles of argument.* NY: Macmillan.

Patter, G.K. (1925). *Practical argumentation.* NY: The Century Co.

Perry, F.M. (1906). *An introductory course in argumentation.* NY: American Book.

Potter, D. (1954). *Argumentation and debate: Principles and practices.* NY: Dryden Press.

Rieke, R.D. and Sillars, M.O. (1984). *Argumentation and the decision makingprocess* (2nd Ed.) Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.

Rottenberg, A.T. (1985). *Elements of argument: A text and reader.* NY: St. Martin's Press.

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

_____ . (1984). "Response to Ulrich." *Journal of the American Forensic Association, 21* (Fall) 94-%.

Ruby, L. and Yarber, R.E. (1974). *The art of making sense.* (3rd Ed) NY: J.B. Lippincott.

Sanders, G. H. (1983). *Introduction to contemporary academic debate.* Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.

Scott, R. L. (1960). "On the meaning of the term *prima facie* in argumentation." *Central States Speech Journal,* XII Autumn 33-37.

Toulmin, S., Rieke, R. and Janik, A. (1979). *An introduction to reasoning.* NY: Macmillan.

Ulrich, W. (1984). "Debate as Dialectic: A defense of the tabula rasa approach to judging." *Journal of the American Forensic Association, 24* (Fall) 89-93.

Warnick, B. (1981). "Arguing Value Propositions." *Journal of the American Forensic Association,* 18, 109-119.

Whately, R. (1828,1861). The elements of rhetoric in Thonssen, L. et al., (1970). *Speech criticism* (2nd Ed.). NY: Ronald Press.

Wood, S. and Midgley, J. (1989). *Prima facie: A guide to value debate* (2nd Ed.). Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt.

Ziegelmueller, G.W., Kay, J. and Dause, C.A., (1990). *Argumentation: Inquiry and advocacy* (2nd). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICES

Developing and Managing a Peer Forensics Coaching Program

Carolyn Keefe*

Reasons for Developing a Program

For the usual Director of Forensics, the word "shortage" has ever-present meanings—a shortage of funds, office space, vehicles, nearby tournaments, publicity, and time. Each lack can have adverse consequences on a program, but the latter poses the greatest threat to its educational goals. When time is scarce, the coaching sessions may be neither as frequent nor as long as they need to be. Although some competitors, particularly the varsity members, can make progress with little help from a coach, the novices deprived of coaching tend to flounder, become discouraged, and drop off the team. Therefore, finding more coaching time may be the most important concern faced by the Director of Forensics.

Linked to the need for additional coaching hours is the Director's interest in expanding the learning opportunities for team members. One way to abet this on-going objective is to put students to work as teachers,[1] because the process of teaching is in itself a means of learning. Backing this axiom is contemporary research on peer tutoring that shows "the achievement gains for the tutors are often as great or greater than those for the 'tutees.'"[2]

Model for the Program

This article delineates a system designed and implemented for dealing with the time shortage problem while simultaneously stressing student educational development. The system taps the peer coaching potential that is available on every team. It also generates academic credit and better grades for the peer coaches by utilizing a version of the management-by-objectives (MBO) approach, which can be defined as "a managerial philosophy and technique that attempts to draw on people's needs for achievement, competence, and autonomy, by allowing them to set their own objectives, goals, and performance criteria."[3]

To insure that the goals of individuals will contribute to the overall goals of the organization and that progress toward reaching them is

maintained, conferences between managers and subordinates are essential. Toward these ends, Castetter and Heisler set up a five-step performance appraisal model, using it for managing school administrative personnel: (1) Pre-Appraisal Planning Conference, (2) Performance Appraisal, (3) Performance Progress Review Conference, (4) Individual Development Program, and (5) Post-Development Program Review Conference.[4]

With three modifications, the Castetter/Heisler model can be applied to the managing of peer forensics coaches. First, the addition of a preliminary step is needed for peer coaches to notify the Director of Forensics that they intend to register for the program. Second, in the Pre-Appraisal Planning Conference Step, rather than having the manager (in this case, the Director of Forensics) meet individually with the subordinate (the peer coach), the forensics adaptation calls for a meeting with all the peer coaches. Third, the Post-Development Program Review Conference takes the form of a written, not an in-person appraisal. Both the second and third modifications are timesaving measures.[5]

Managing the Program

The program operationally defines peer forensics coaching as a credit-generating[6] MBO system whereby an experienced speech/debate team member[7] guides a less experienced member of the same team through the process of tournament preparation. The preliminary step and the five steps in the appraisal system are described below and depicted in the Appendices. The evaluation forms that are mentioned were designed specifically for the program.

Preliminary Step: Declaration of Intent
1. Students interested in obtaining one hour of credit for coaching must notify the Director of Forensics by the end of the registration period for the upcoming semester. The student must have competed for at least one semester in a minimum of four intercollegiate forensics tournaments.
2. At least two weeks before the start of the semester, the peer coaches will be given written notification of the Pre-Appraisal Planning Conference.

Step 1: Pre-Appraisal Planning Conference
1. This meeting (announced above) will be held in the office of the Director of Forensics during the first week of each semester.
2. The peer coaches and the Director of Forensics will clarify their objectives by briefly discussing these topics: (a) the goals of forensics as an educational process, and (b) the means of carrying out these goals through the particular forensics program. Also, a link

will be made with the educational goals of the institution as stated in the college/university catalog.

3. Although each peer coach has been and still is being coached, he or she may need to review the stages in the coaching process.[8] These will be delineated by the Director of Forensics. An important emphasis will be the setting of goals for each coaching session.

4. Performance standards for each peer coach will be established:
    a. Each student will coach one forensics participant (henceforth known as "coachee")[8] in debate or one individual event. The coachee will be a novice, i.e., a person who has competed in less than four tournaments.
    b. Each peer coach will personally contact his or her coachee and work out a coaching schedule that includes a minimum of four fifty-minute sessions before the first tournament, two before the second, and one before the third in which the event/debate will be presented.
    c. Each peer coach will hold a post-tournament ballot review with his or her coachee.
    d. Each peer coach will keep a coaching log that describes: (1) contact attempts, successful or not, (2) important aspects of each coaching session, including goal(s), strengths/weaknesses of the coachee's performance and how the peer coach dealt with each, (3) post-tournament review of the coachee's ballots, and (4) degree of success in reaching the goal(s) set in Step 4.1, below.

5. The following appraisal procedures for peer coaches, including the evaluation forms, will be explained by the Director of Forensics:
    a. Between the first and second tournaments, the Director of Forensics will observe the peer coach in a direct coaching session. Form A: Rating Sheet for Observation of Peer Forensics Coach (Appendix A) will be used.
    b. Each coachee will evaluate his or her peer coach by employing Form B: Rating Sheet for Coachee's Appraisal of Peer Forensics Coach (Appendix B). This will be done immediately following the last tournament for which peer coaching services are provided.
    c. Immediately following the last tournament (see 5.b. above), the peer coach will submit his or her coaching log. The criteria on Form C: Rating Sheet for Peer Coaching Log (Appendix C) will serve as the basis for appraisal.
    d. These grading weights will hold: Form A=25%, Form B = 25%, and Form C = 50% of the peer coach's final grade.

6. The Director of Forensics will then present a list of coachees, and the peer coaches will help match coaches with coachees. The

forensics experience of the peer coaches, their strengths and weaknesses, and their personal preferences will be considered. This selection process will help the peer coaches set their individual performance targets.

7. The Pre-Appraisal Planning Conference will conclude with a brief discussion of how the performance standards and the appraisal procedures are linked to the educational goals of the team.

Step 2: Performance Appraisal

1. The Director of Forensics will observe the peer coach in a direct fifty-minute coaching situation (see Step 1.5.a.).
2. The Director of Forensics will use Form A on which to record evaluative comments.

Step 3: Performance Progress Review Conference

1. Immediately following the observation above, the Director of Forensics will meet alone with the peer coach to review Form A and to discuss his or her learning experiences as a coach.
2. The student's successes and difficulties in peer coaching will be discussed.
3. The Director of Forensics will give counsel on how to lessen or overcome the difficulties.

Step 4: Individual Development Program

1. The peer coach will set one or more coaching goals that he or she wants to accomplish. The goal(s) will be recorded in the appropriate place on Form A. The peer coach will retain the original sheet; the Director of Forensics will keep a file copy.
2. When the coaching assignment ends (usually after the third tournament), the peer coach will assess and record his or her progress in reaching the goal(s). The fourth section of the log will consist of this assessment.

Step 5: Post-Development Program Review Appraisal

1. The Director of Forensics will collect the peer coach's log and the coachee's appraisal (Form B).
2. Using Form C, the Director of Forensics will evaluate the log and then assign a grade based on the ratio specified under step l.5.d.
3. The Director of Forensics will enter the peer coach's grade (A, B, C, D, F) on Form C and will return the log, along with the originals of Forms A, B, and C, to the peer coach. File copies will be retained.
4. Unless the peer coach is a graduating senior, he or she will be able to continue receiving one credit hour for coaching each semester using the above system.

Assessment of tbe Program

Instituted in the spring semester of 1980, the program continued through the last eight and a half years of the author's tenure as Director of Forensics. During that period the following strengths and weaknesses of the system emerged.

Program Strengths

1. The program increases the coaching staff and the number of hours devoted to coaching in a given semester. Simple calculations show this statement to be true. Each peer coach is required to spend a minimum of 400 minutes in coaching, including 50 minutes in Step 2: Performance Appraisal. (Many peer coaches far exceed this time frame.) To gain this supplemental coaching service, the Director of Forensics must devote approximately 155 minutes per peer coach to administration and conferences. Thus, for each peer coach's work the program realizes an advantage of about four hours a semester. This amount may seem insignificant, but multiplied by the three or four peer coaches that a director can manage without undue strain, the benefit translates into an increase of 12 to 16 "found" coaching sessions.

2. The program aids the educational development of both the peer coaches and the coachees. For example, one young woman who discovered her outstanding coaching ability decided to become a forensics professional. Today she directs forensics at a midwestern college. Another peer coach merited these comments from the Director of Forensics recorded on Form A;

> "This session confirms my overall impression of your excellence as a coach. I wish I owned a *big company,* and I'd put you *in charge* of training employees in communication skills. I'd have every confidence that in every way —in both management and teaching areas—you'd be highly competent.

Before the age of 30 this coach had become the Director of Marketing at a main office of the world's largest accounting firm. In this capacity she has pioneered her role of communication consultant for the partners.

Coachees also attest to the educational benefits from the program. One typical comment from Form B reads: "I see an overall improvement in my performance at tournaments—a lot of which is attributed to [the peer coach]." And another coachee claims: "[The peer coach's] experience and talent were beneficial to her ability to point out my weaknesses and to give advice for improvement." On yet another Form B, a coachee praises a peer coach for making her aware of negative delivery habits and teaching her how to use transitions.

Overwhelmingly, the file records show that peer forensics coaching can contribute significantly to the educational development of the team members involved.

3. The program provides a systematic way to appraise peer coaching. Even without a managerial system, peer coaching often takes place, having been initiated by team members who want to helpful. Although such expansive efforts are commendable, they do not generate any data that can serve as the basis for grading. Nor can incidental peer coaching be counted on to be regular or goal-directed. The MBO forensics peer coaching system, however, prevents the fragmentation of effort, provides grading criteria, and collects input from the three individuals who interact in the process.

Program Weaknesses

1. At times, administering the program can be difficult. When the system was in its initial stage, keeping track of the three forms was a problem. After the Peer Coaching Credit Record Sheet was put into use, that difficulty abated. The only other administrative problem is scheduling the Performance Appraisal (Step 2) and Performance Progress Review Conference (Step 3) between the first and second tournaments when coaching demands on the Director of Forensics are especially heavy. Early guidance and goal setting for peer coaches is important so that Steps 2 and 3 can be slotted without time loss through postponement.

2. Some coachees do not take the program seriously. They do not understand the importance of scheduling and keeping peer coaching appointments. If they show up at a session, they resist focusing on tasks, preferring small-talk or some other diversion. Peer coaches rightly view such behavior as a threat to their own objectives; often they become anxious and wonder what they can do to improve the situation.

This undesirable attitude of a coachee, however, is not a totally negative factor in the peer coaching process, because it provides a turn-about challenge for the coach. The Director of Forensics can speak assuringly that the coachee is mirroring behavior sometimes seen in the classroom and then can work with the peer coach on ways to effect attitude change. Perhaps the most successful measure for giving an industrious tone to the process is scheduling the peer coaching observation session at the early prescribed time (between the first and second tournaments). If this step is handled professionally, even nonchalant coachees will be able to grasp how their role can contribute to individual, team, and institutional educational goals. Additionally, for the peer coach this session can be a means of building credibility.

Conclusion

Intercollegiate forensics, with its constant demand for coaching and its mandate to educate,[10] provides an environment for the development and study of peer coaching. From one corner of the forensics community has come an MBO peer coaching program designed to increase the coaching staff and render educational benefits to the participants. This article describes how the system was adapted from a school administrative personnel appraisal model and how it operates. Proven workable and beneficial, the program can be modified to meet the particular needs of other forensics teams or can serve as the starting point for yet other approaches.

Notes

[1]Literature in the field of education is replete with studies on peer tutoring in a variety of disciplines, but not in speech communication. See, for example, Ora Sterling Anderson and Laura J. Smith, "Peer Tutors in a College Reading Laboratory: A Model that *Works," Reading Improvement* 24.4 (1987): 238-47; Mary P Deming, "Peer Tutoring and the Teaching of Writing," Paper presented at the Meeting of the Southeastern Writing Center Association, Mobile, AL, 17-19 April 1986, Dialog, ERIC, ED 27* 019; J. H. C. Moust, et al, "Peer Teaching and Higher Level Cognitive Learning Outcomes in Problem-Based Learning," *Higher Education* 18 (1989): 737-42; and Gabrielle Wepner, "Successful Math Remediation: Training Peer Tutors," *College Teaching* 33.4 (1985): 165-67.

[2]Robert E, Slavin, "Learning Together: Cooperative Groups and Peer Tutoring Produce Significant Academic Gains," *American Educator* Summer 1986: 13. See also Sinclair Goodlad and Beverley Hirst, *Peer Tutoring: A Guide to Leaming by Teaching* (New York: Nichols Publishing, 1989); Muriel Harris, "Peer Tutoring: How Tutors Learn." *Teaching English in the Two-Year College* 15.1 (1988): 28-33; and Michael Webb and Wendy Schwartz, "Children Teaching Children: A Good Way to Learn," *PTA Today* 14.1 (1988): 16-17.

[3]Ross H. Webber, Marilyn A. Morgan, and Paul C. Browne, *Management: Basic Elements,* 3rd ed. of *Managing Organizations* (Homewood: Irwin, 1985) 356.

[4]William B. Castetter and Richard S. Heisler, *Appraising and Improving the Performance of School Administrative Personnel* (Philadelphia: Center for Field Studies, Graduate School of Education, University of Pennsylvania, 1971). The process model is found in p. 38. For other applications of MBO, see Deborah Britt Roebuck, "An MBO Approach to Teaching Organizational Communication," *Bulletin of the Association for Business Communication* 52.1 (1989): 26-28 and David E. Terpstra, et al., "The Effects of MBO on Levels of Performance and Satisfaction Among University Faculty," *Group and Organization Studies* 7 (1982): 353-66.

[5]One criticism of the MBO system is that it is time-consuming. See Webber, Morgan, and Browne, p. 353. Inasmuch as time is at a premium for the Director of Forensics, short-cuts needed to be built into the system.

[6]At West Chester University students involved in special projects such as this program are able to receive credit under SPC 399: Directed Studies. The Director of Forensics is granted one-quarter load reduction for carrying out the role but is given no extra remuneration for supervising SPC 399 projects in forensics.

[7]"Experienced speech/debate team member" is defined as one who has competed for at least one semester in a minimum of four intercollegiate forensics tournaments.

[8]To the author's knowledge, no systematic study of coaching stages has been conducted. In instructing her peer coaches, she delineates these stages: Orientation, Early Analysis, Substantive Analysis, Delivery, Polishing, and Follow-Up. For one type of

systematic coaching study, see Carolyn Keefe "Verbal Interactions in Coaching the Oral Interpretation of Poetry," *National Forensic Journal* 3.1 (1985): 55-69.

[9]Inasmuch as both members of the coaching dyad are students as well as peers, a means of differentiating between them is needed. The coined term "coachee" will be used for the recipient of coaching.

[10]George Ziegelmueller and Donn W. Parson, "Strengthening Educational Goals and Programs," in *American Forensics in Perspective,* ed. Donn W. Parson (Annandale: SCA, 1984): 37-48.

FORM A: RATING SHEET FOR OBSERVATION OF
PEER FORENSICS COACH

PEER COACH	**COACHEE**	**APPRAISER**

Criteria Rating Scale: 4 excellent; 3 good; 2 fair; 1 poor

Total Points: 21-24=A; 15-20=B; 9-14 = C; 3-8=D

POINTS   CRITERIA

_____ 1. Appropriateness of goal(s) for this coaching session

_____ 2. Accuracy in identifying coachee's strengths and
         weaknesses

_____ 3. Reinforcement of coachee's strengths

_____ 4. Ability to modify coachee's weaknesses

_____ 5. Utilization of allotted time

_____ 6. Appropriateness of goal(s) for next coaching session

_____   TOTAL POINTS   _____   GRADE

Goal(s) for this session:

_____

Goal(s) for next session:

_____

Goal(s) for self and coachee (to be reached before or by the end of the

third tournament): _____

Appendix B

FORM B: RATING SHEET FOR COACHEE'S APPRAISAL OF PEER FORENSICS COACH

_____   _____
      PEER COACH   COACHEE APPRAISER

Criteria Rating Scale:4 excellent; 3 good; 2 fair; 1 poor

Total Points: 21-24=A; 15-20 = B; 9-14 = C; 3-8=D

POINTS   CRITERIA

_____ 1. Cooperation in working out coaching schedules

_____ 2. Dependability in keeping appointments

_____3.   Skill in explaining procedures/concepts/techniques

_____4. Ability to identify coachee's weaknesses and make

                suggestions for improvement

_____ 5. Understanding of coachee's psychological needs

_____6. Interest in coachee's educational development

_____ TOTAL POINTS   _____ GRADE

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

Appendix C
FORM C: RATING SHEET FOR PEER COACHING LOG

PEER COACH   **COACHEE**   **APPRAISER**

Criteria Rating Scale; 8 excellent; 6 good; 4 fair; 2 poor

Total Points: 42-48=A; 30-41 = B; 18-29 = C; 6-17 = D

POINTS   CRITERIA

_____ 1. Promptness in making contacts with coachee

_____ 2. Judgment in spacing coaching sessions

_____ 3. Accuracy in identifying coachee's strengths and
weaknesses

_____ 4. Creativity in dealing with coachee's strengths and
weaknesses

_____ 5. Sensitivity/understanding in handling post-tourna-
ment ballot review

_____ 6. Success in reaching coaching goal(s)

_____ TOTAL POINTS   _____   GRADE

GRADE SUMMARY

Form A - 25%   ____

Form B - 25%   ____

Form C - 50%   ____

Coaching Grade ___
(one Credit)

REVIEW OF PROFESSIONAL RESOURCES

Jack Kay, Editor

Prima Facie—A Guide to Value Debate, 2nd ed. Stephen Wood and John Midgley, eds. Dubuque: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Co., 1989.

 Prima Facie—A Guide to Value Debate provides readers with an introduction into what is currently the most popular form of academic debate at the collegiate level. As a policy debate educator with a desire to develop value debate coaching skills, I hoped *Prima Facie* would be a primer for exploring the differences between argumentation of propositions of fact/value and propositions of policy. *Prima Facie,* however, deals less with discovering the differences one would expect to find and focuses more on the justifications for supporting value debate over that of policy.

 The excerpt of the book's preface on the back cover points to popularity as the standard for writing the book. "The continued popularity of value debate is one indication of the importance of this Lincoln/Douglas style debating on both the high school and collegiate levels further underscores the need for a critical examination of the process of value debate __Not as burdened by the specialized demands of policy debate ..." (xiii) Chapter 1, the "Profile of Academic Debate," by Pelham and Watt, offers an historical background of the development of academic debate and then attempts to distinguish value and policy debating by pointing out the generalizations of policy debate as symptoms from which debate was borne. This philosophy would be fine if the content of the book emphasized true differences between the two activities, but the reality is that *Prima Facie* actually stresses the "similarities between debaters and the previous description of CEDA debate. However, it is believed that on a general level these descriptions are valid." (8)

 This becomes the basis for the entire review of this book. Each chapter is torn between whether value debate should be similar or different from policy debate. After the initial chapter and preface argue that value debate serves different purposes and goals than policy debate—lesser time and evidence requirements, slower and more persuasive, can compete without school experience, appeals to a different group of students— because of its nature. The next chapter, "Value and Policy Debate," by Lawson, discusses the myths of value debate. Lawson notes that value debaters can do the same things that policy debaters can. He concedes that changing the type of proposition debated does not address delivery and speed concerns: "There is no inherent reason why issues of policy should be argued quickly and issues

of value argued slowly; and, CEDA's stress on delivery skills has not freed debate from the problems of rapidfire delivery." (20) This seems inconsistent with the position taken by Pelham and Watts, although it appears to identify correctly the state of affairs in CEDA debate.

Lawson then addresses other artificial differences between policy and value debate. He argues that value debate should have topicality and definitional issues and that affirmatives have the right to defend examples of the resolutions rather than the entire resolution, just as they do in policy debate. The affirmative may go so far as to present a plan, he points out. I believe that by allowing value debate these options, it destroys the "differences" that value debate proponents say make it such a "unique" activity.

Wood and Midgley claim that the justification for this text is that past argumentation texts have not given fair treatment to debating propositions of judgment. But aside from the Chapter 3, "Topic Analysis" by Don Brownlee, there is NOT a single chapter unique to the value debate experience. Brownlee discusses how to analyze a proposition of fact/value by exploring the context of the resolution and presenting the criteria and how the facts support the criteria. However, most argumentation texts do provide a section on discovering issues for fact/value questions and include information similar to that provided by Brownlee.

Brownlee correctly argues that, "Even if the affirmative does not present a plan, per se, they cannot hold themselves or their case immune from the policy implications that may logically arise from their interpretations of the topic. . . .Just as policy resolutions are not exempt from influence and effects of values, value resolutions are not exempt from the policies they may effect." (23) This is the heart of the issue: Is there a unique advantage to debating questions of value with policy implications? Or, is it better (from an educational standpoint) to debate policy questions with value implications? Or, does it matter? *Prima Facie,* however, runs from this topic. What both policy and fact/value proponents should be addressing is the question of educational value for the students. Until this concern is addressed, the worth of either policy and/or value debate will be hard to discern.

The remainder of the text is a standard argumentation book written with many references to policy debate, explanations and comparisons to policy debate, and repetitive justifications for having a value analysis on such standard topics as evidence, research, refutation, testing of arguments, cross-examination, delivery, style, and ethics on debate. Even the chapters on affirmative and negative strategies do little more than rename concepts: disadvantages become value objections

and counterplans become counter values, although the implications whether policy or fact/value are the same.

Policy and value educators should realize that making artificial distinctions between two essentially similar activities is not the solution for the future. I do not suggest that real differences do not exist between policy and value debate. However, the focus of the true differences and the recognition of similarities must become the starting point for discussion if the best educational product for students is the goal. Maybe there is a necessity for having debate over both types of propositions, maybe not. But until the real issues are addressed, the academic debate will continue to lack stability and foster fragmentation. *Prima Facie* wants the best of both worlds. It denigrates policy debate to justify its existence when necessary, but it addresses value debate by taking many of the positive aspects that have come from policy debating over the years. *Prima Facie,* at best, does not address the real differences of value and policy debate, and at worst, increases misunderstandings about the true educational purposes of value debate while fostering some hasty generalizations about policy debate.

<div align="right">

Ede Warner
Wayne State University

</div>

Prima Facie: A Guide to Value Debate, 2nd ed. Stephen Wood and John Midgley, eds. Kendall/Hunt, 1989.

Debating Values. Michael D. Bartanen and David A. Frank. Gorsuch Scarisbrick, 1991.

Without question, the nature of academic debate in the United States is changing, with more and more students and coaches abandoning the tradition of interscholastic policy debate and entering the realm of "value" debate through the forums of CEDA debate at the collegiate level and Lincoln-Douglas debate at the high school level. Traditional debate texts which focus on propositions of policy, it is claimed, no longer serve the needs of teachers who are training students to wrestle with propositions of value. The result: new debate texts which attempt to address the needs and demands associated with value dispute. Two competent entrants in this new market are Wood and Midgley's *Prima Facie: A Guide to Value Debate* and Bartanen and Frank's *Debating Values*.

Wood and Midgley present an edited collection of essays which aim to provide practical material for students who engage in debate over questions of value. In addition to addressing the standard subjects included in every argumentation and debate text, they provide a chronology of the creation and evolution of the Cross Examination Debate

Society (CEDA) as well as justify the importance of debating propositions of value. Bartanen and Frank also present a practical debate manual, providing a bit more attention to identifying types of values, value hierarchies, and stock issues specific to propositions of value.

Both texts have strong attributes which warrant their consideration as required or supplemental texts for a basic course in debate in which the emphasis is on value dispute. Both feature a highly practical approach to debate. Both are easy to read, with clear and compelling examples. However, readers seeking textbooks which emphasize a strong theoretical and philosophical approach to argumentation will be disappointed with both of the texts.

Three chapters in the Wood and Midgley text are particularly valuable. "Audience Analysis in Value Debate," Chapter 13, written by Michael Guiliano, does an excellent job of demonstrating the importance of audience analysis. Although more attention could have been paid to dealing with judge whose personal value system opposes the debater's proposed value system, the chapter does offer a wealth of practical advice on how to adapt to diverse audiences. Chapter 14, "The Tournament Experience," by Edward Harris, Jr., does a superior job of preparing students for participation in contests—helping them demystify the experience. Chapter 15, "Lincoln-Douglas Debating," authored by John Midgley, should be required reading for all students and coaches of Lincoln-Douglas debate.

One of the most important contributions of Bartanen and Frank's text is the discussion of stock issues for questions of value. The original stock issues for questions of judgment, as interpreted from the Greek and Latin texts by Lee Hultzen, include *translatio, an sit, quid sit,* and *quali sit* (Jurisdiction or topicality, existence of fact, definition, and quality). Bartanen and Frank root similar questions in rhetorically and audience centered issues of definition, criteria, significance to the audience, and comparison. A second important contribution involves the authors' discussion of value hierarchies and the types of assertions and claims that support such hierarchies.

Do the two works reviewed here constitute important theoretical treatises clarifying the theoretical underpinnings of value argument? My conclusion is that they do not. However, both texts serve as valuable resources for the teacher of argumentation and debate. They are worthy of serious consideration.

<div align="right">

Jack Kay
Wayne State University

</div>

Argumentation: Inquiry and Advocacy, 2nd ed. George W. Ziegel-mueller, Jack Day, and Charles A. Dause. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1990.

Argumentation: Inquiry and Advocacy offers the state-of-the-art in argumentation theory and serves as a primer for the beginning debater or student of critical thinking. Ziegelmueller, Kay, and Dause present a theoretically-consistent synthesis of current theory, utilizing easy-to-read examples to illustrate theoretical constructs.

The emphasis of *Argumentation: Inquiry and Advocacy* is twofold. On one hand, the textbook concentrates on the theoretical development argumentation as an inquiry process involving the identification and development of one's own beliefs. The text also focuses on the advocacy process of argumentation, which develops the ability to justify beliefs and opinions to others. These underlying themes are consistently and clearly identified throughout the text.

Chapter 1, "A Perspective on Argumentation," pertains much less to the beginning student of argument; rather, it addresses the varying perspectives used in academic debate theory. This chapter demonstrates the underlying assumptions of argumentation theory as a necessary and relevant tool in society. Addressing the need for rational discourse in spite of institutionalized substitutes such as coercion and confrontational protests, self-interest and emotional pleas, and the inability to locate the "truth" due to limitation of the mind and a social constructionist view of reality, Ziegelmueller, Kay, and Dause provide justification for finding "probable" truths.

I do question the chronology of the textbook, as Chapter 2, Chapter 3, and Chapter 4 discuss concepts applicable to argumentation as process, while a definition and development of "argument" is not addressed until Chapter 5. Ziegelmueller, Kay, and Dause argue that inquiry and advocacy are distinct but interdependent; however, the building and evaluation of one's own beliefs and values seems a priori to understanding how to communicate those beliefs and values of others.

The discussion of the basic concepts of argumentation (Chapter 2) including propositions, burden of proof, prima facie case, and presumption are all clear and complete. Chapter 3 and Chapter 4 teach the beginning student how to discover essential issues in a proposition of fact/value or policy. An equal treatment is given to both types of propositions, and although the stock issues for policy analysis are focused upon, a treatment of the prevalent paradigm of "policy-making" is also offered.

The true strength of the text occurs in the next several chapters. *Argumentation: Inquiry and Advocacy* does a superior job of synthesizing

the current knowledge on the nature of argument, the inductive and deductive reasoning processes, and the testing of arguments. Ziegelmueller, Kay, and Dause provide a much simpler, but just as complete, view of the argumentation process as other theorists such as Toulmin. A beginning debate student only need recognize the "reasoning process" and its five types, three being inductive and two being deductive.

The authors also redefine inductive and deductive reasoning, arguing that past definitions of the "general to the specific" and the "specific to the general" are incorrect and inadequate for the purpose of employing informal logic. Inductive reasoning as defined here "is inadequate on two counts," they argue. "First, it fails to identify the nature of the process involved in moving from the data to the conclusion. Second, the definition does not accurately describe the nature of all inductive conclusion. Although it is true that inductive reasoning may involve the examination of numerous particular instances in order to arrive at a general (or class-inclusive) statement, it is also true that it may involve a comparison among particulars to arrive at a conclusion specific to only one instance" (59). Conceptually, the treatment of an argument as "data which leads to a conclusion via the reasoning process" is the most simple yet complete explanation of argument to date. This construct is easy to teach and not difficult for the beginning student to grasp.

The text provides a well-developed section on logical outlining as the tool by which the advocate organizes and tests beliefs. One is convinced of the utility of *Argumentation: Inquiry and Advocacy's* concept of argument when it is applied to the outlining concept. Ziegelmueller, Kay, and Dause's use of the reasoning process through outlining offers a visual portrayal of argument just as developed as the Toulmin model, with less ambiguity and more consistency.

The latter half of the text focuses on the practical application of the theory for the development of skills, and identifies how argumentation varies depending in which field, format, or forum the process takes place. "Effective argumentation requires us to recognize the shared purpose that guides the community in which our inquiry and advocacy occurs (the field), to understand the arena in which our arguments are presented (the forum), and to be aware of the conventions that influence the presentation of our arguments and those of our opponents (the format)." (149) This section is well-written and synthesizes the various viewpoints of argument fields as well as provides an explanation to the beginning student to recognize the impact of the format and the forum for argument.

The chapter on cross-examination is outstanding. It provides a well-focused discussion concerning the purposes and strategies for cross-examination. There are sections on the psychological aspects of

the concept as well as practical considerations. This chapter, when utilized effectively, can do much to improve the skills of anyone involved in cross-examination situations.

Finally, this text is not a "how to" book. It does not focus on repetitive exercises focused at teaching the beginning academic debater all the mechanics. While the text addresses delivery, style, note-taking, strategies, and case construction, there are more effective materials, if the sole purpose is instruction. But if the goal is to teach the theoretical underpinnings as the foundation of providing a complete knowledge of argumentation including practical orientation to academic debate, this text is the best available work.

<div style="text-align: right">

Ede Warner
Wayne State University

</div>

A Review of "Dialogue in the Forensic Community: Proceedings of the Conference on Forensic Education," edited by Jack Kay and Julie Lee. Published by the National Federation of State High School Association, 1990.

"Dialogue in the Forensic Community: Proceedings of the Conference on Forensic Education" is a useful, thought-provoking publication that should find its way to the bookshelf of every forensic educator. Filled with ideas generated at a three-day conference hosted by Northwestern University and sponsored by the National Federation of State High School Associations in December, 1989, the monograph is readable, thorough, and encourages action by all who value forensic experiences.

The fact that it reflects the views of leaders in forensic education at both the high school and university levels contributes to its uniqueness and value. Communication departments which offer speech pedagogy courses should adopt the proceedings as required reading for their graduate students. Topics discussed could provoke interesting debate and classroom discussion.

In 92 pages, the proceedings highlight many controversial issues which often threaten forensic activities. From workshops in debate and individual events, to recruitment of minority participants in forensic activities, the proceedings capture issues critical to educators and program administrators.

Upon reading the "Editor's Forward" and keynote addresses of David Zarefsky and Daryl Fisher, the tone of what is to follow in the proceedings is clear. Aristotle likely would praise the combination of ethical, pathetic, and logical proofs used by the writers. A sense of community and commitment are strongly communicated.

Even more important, however, is that the proceedings are solution-oriented. The conference participants endorsed 82 resolutions, all of which are justified briefly in the monograph.

Excerpts from many of the 30 position papers discussed at the conference are included. The papers focused specifically on issues related to six broad topic areas: Accreditation, Evaluation and Assessment; Role and Mission of Forensic Institutes; Forensic Director Recruitment; Enhancing Opportunities; Instructional Practices and the Role of Competition; Recruiting by Colleges, Mutual Interests, and Organizational Relations.

Many innovative approaches are advanced. Issues are presented in ways that focus on the similarities and interdependence of university and high school programs, rather than on differences and barriers to cooperation.

One example of a common concern discussed at the conference was summer workshops. A study related to the topic, conducted by Edward A. and Shelly S. Hinck, is included as the appendix of the proceedings. Forensic educators likely will find the perceptions it addresses familiar and useful when organizing and recruiting workshop participants.

Chapter 5 takes on the difficult challenge of organizing the resolutions debated during the Parliamentary Session held on the third day of the Conference on Forensic Education. Two major categories of motions are included: those related to general issues in forensic education (i.e., promotion of forensic activities externally and internally, teacher competency and development, program support, curriculum and instruction, serving students); those related to high school forensic institutes and workshops. Readers with emphasis in individual events are apt to find the resolutions related to the general issues category most interesting and relevant.

If there is a weakness in the proceedings, it is in regard to the question, "What next?" will meaningful action be taken in response to the resolutions? As the editor warns, "Should these recommendations merely stay on the pages of this document, our efforts will have been for naught. The charge facing the forensic community is to carefully examine the recommendations, subject them to vigorous debate, and to implement those which will improve forensic education."

By reading "Dialogue in the Forensic Community: Proceedings of the Conference on Forensic Education," that important process can prosper.

Shawn L. McGee
Wayne State University