

Evaluating Directors of Forensics: From Dimensions to Prototype

Mary Ann Danielson
John Hollwitz

Mary Danielson (MA, University of Nebraska, 1989) is assistant professor, Department of Communication Studies, Creighton University, Omaha, NE 68178, and John Hollwitz (PhD, Northwestern University, 1980) is associate professor and Jacobson Chair, Department of Communication Studies, Creighton University, Omaha, NE 68178.

The evaluation of Directors of Forensics (DOFs) surfaced as an issue in 1974, 1984, and in the early 1990s. Despite repeated attention, little has resulted from forensic educators' discussions. The lack of forensic evaluation seems especially prevalent at the administrative level. Forensic educators may concede that the evaluation of students' performances, judges' ballots, or trends in forensics activities is necessary, yet very few forensic educators and researchers have turned the evaluative spotlight on themselves—the DOFs. Given increasing societal and educational pressure for accountability (Alexander, 1993; Schnoor, 1993), DOFs must address the issue of evaluating forensic educators' performances.

Hollwitz and Danielson (1992) developed and tested an evaluative instrument to be utilized by and for DOFs. This paper expands upon their previous research, for it develops a prototypical evaluation instrument for DOFs. We provide a historical background on forensic evaluation, introduce how the job assessment approach has been utilized to evaluate forensics, delineate both the dimensions and tasks in the prototypical evaluation instrument(s), and conclude with a discussion of the study's implications for the forensic community.

EVALUATING DIRECTORS OF FORENSICS

DOFs have been historically evaluated by traditional

university standards for promotion and/or tenure. Conferees at the 1974 Sedalia Conference recommended that "the forensics educator should meet the department and institutional criteria for promotion, tenure and compensation. . . . They should not be held to higher standards, nor do they seek lower standards" (Definitional statement, 1974, p. 47). Whereas no one in forensics argued for lower evaluation standards, disagreement existed on the criterion or criteria utilized for evaluation.

Although the Sedalia Conference concluded that "the primary criterion for evaluating the performance of the forensics educator should be teaching effectiveness, including the directing of forensics as a teaching function" (Definitional statement, 1974, p. 47), which Boileau (1990) supported, not all forensic educators agree. Some DOFs argue that forensic activities cut across all three areas of traditional, although not universal, academic evaluation: teaching, scholarship, and service; moreover, they argue that evaluations should reflect contributions in each of these three areas (AFA Policy, 1993). Dudczak (1985) summarizes the paradox inherent in this paradigm:

They [DOFs] have a unique assignment which cuts across all three areas of the traditional categories for promotion and tenure, yet their evaluation either categorizes their efforts within a single category or understates it by making quantitative comparisons of output without cognizance of assignment load. In either case the forensics educator often finds his/her relative evaluation diminished in comparison with department peers. (pp. 10-11)

Ten years later, the Second National Conference on Forensics (1984) recognized that forensic educators should develop an evaluation that would recognize their various contributions.

Congalton states (in Dudczack & Zarefsky, 1984):
forensics coaches must work to ensure that they are receiving credit for the many tasks which they perform. When the forensics specialist is called upon to serve numerous roles, ranging from coach to administrator, then some value should be placed on all the tasks which a forensics coach carries out. Evaluation committees should be made aware of the totality of a forensics coach's responsibilities. Only then, will forensics educators be given credit for the many tasks which they are called upon to perform, (p. 33)

Despite the perceived need for a promotion and tenure instrument, the 1984 Conference listed only possible criteria for evaluation.

Two decades after the 1974 Sedalia Conference, forensic educators' progress toward development and utilization of evaluative instruments is minimal. Sternhagen (1994) notes "a lack of work examining how forensics programs are evaluated" (p. 2). Despite strong accountability and pragmatic rationales, forensic educators have hesitated to address proactively issues of evaluation. The AFA's Policy Debate Caucus (1993) work is the one exception.

The need in 1996 for forensic evaluation has not diminished, for the forensic community can no longer ignore educational administrators' demands for evaluation. Albert (1991) argues that forensic practitioners and administrators should provide university administrators with a consensus about the guidelines for evaluation: "From an administrative standpoint, the challenge of considering forensics is the challenge of evaluating forensics activities in which faculty members participate. Administrators would benefit if forensics practitioners and administrators could develop some

consensus about the guidelines which should be used to evaluate the forensics work of faculty members" (Albert, 1991, p. 7). Because evaluation at the college and university level will continue, an evaluative instrument of the true dimensions of DOFs is needed.

Job Analysis

An evaluation instrument, borrowed from industrial/organizational assessment, was constructed (Hollwitz & Danielson, 1992) to identify and measure the various dimensions, tasks, and worker characteristics associated with performing the functions of the DOF. The instrument is based on the three attributes used in job analysis and assessment: Knowledge, Skills, and Abilities (usually referred to as KSAs). As defined by the Uniform Guidelines (1978), knowledge is the body of information pertinent to a job, skills are the psychomotor capabilities (ability to perform basic skills or functions of the job), and abilities are a behavioral competence. Although the potential for overlapping exists, KSAs provide a way to customize selection and classification procedures.

Job analysis has multiple purposes that include personnel administration, the reduction of exposure to legal liability, and an increase in understanding of and evaluation for a specific academic position. The specific job analysis process uses three steps or stages. (For the creation process, see Hollwitz & Danielson, 1992.) In stage one, job experts who had served as debate and forensic directors identified important tasks and dimensions. Ten overall dimensions emerged through interviews, archival materials, and the Managerial and Professional Job Functions Inventory (MPJFI), a standardized job analysis measure (Baehr, Lonergan, & Hunt, 1988). In stage two, job experts rated tasks associated with these dimensions for their criticality (i.e., the most important tasks for the job completion, tasks occupying the greatest amount of time on the job, or both). Ninety-two tasks (68%) reached the cutoff criterion for importance or frequency. In stage three, job experts used the final list of tasks and dimensions to derive a list of requisite worker

characteristics. These characteristics are the KSAs.

Table 1: DIMENSIONS¹	MEAN (x)
Accounting and Bookkeeping	2.74**
Administering the Speech and Debate Program	2.92**
Arranging Participation in Off-campus Tournaments	2.94**
Coaching Speech and Debate Participants	2.87**
College and Community Service Involvement	1.97
Counseling and Advising Speech and Debate Students	2.32*
Directing On-campus Tournaments	2.38*
Moderating Speech and Debate Student Group	1.59
Recruiting Students for the Speech and Debate Program	2.55**
Teaching a Speech and Debate Class	2.35*

**Essential Dimensions (defined by a x of 2.5 or greater [possible 3.0]).

*Relevant Dimensions (defined by a x of 2.0 or greater [possible 3.0]).

In completing the three stages, ten dimensions were identified:

- accounting and bookkeeping
- administering the speech and debate program
- arranging students' participation in off-campus tournaments
- coaching speech and debate participants
- involvement in college and community service
- counseling and advising speech and debate students
- directing on-campus tournaments
- moderating speech and debate student groups
- recruiting students for the speech and debate program
- teaching a speech and debate class.

Each dimension has various tasks. For example, accounting and bookkeeping include knowledge of basic accounting principles,

knowledge of university bookkeeping procedures, and skill at double-entry bookkeeping.

In a subsequent evaluation of the reliability and validity of the instrument, eight of the original ten dimensions achieved means (\bar{x}) of 2.0 or higher (on a 3.0 scale). (See Table 1 for a complete summary of dimensions' means.) The four "essential" dimensions (\bar{x} of 2.5 or higher) of the DOF's position included (in rank order by mean):

- arranging students' participation in off-campus tournaments
- administering the speech and debate program
- coaching speech and debate participants
- accounting and bookkeeping.

Four "relevant" dimensions (\bar{x} of 2.0-2.49) of the DOF's position included (in rank order by mean):

- recruiting students for the speech and debate program
- teaching a speech and debate class
- directing on-campus tournaments
- counseling and advising speech and debate students.

The two original dimensions "possibly relevant" to all programs (\bar{x} of less than 2.0) include college and community service involvement (1.98) and moderating speech and debate student groups (1.44).

Results show little difference in response attributable to program type, institutional type, or institutional size. One dimension, "arranging students' participation in off-campus tournaments," shows differences across institutions of different sizes ($F[4, 56] = 3.35, p \leq .05$). Post-hoc analyses illustrate that institutions enrolling fewer than 20,000 students rated this dimension as more essential than did institutions with greater than 20,000 ($p < .05$). No additional differences emerged among subgroups of institutions with fewer than 20,000 students.

The reliability of the measures was assessed using Cronbach's alpha coefficient. A reliability score of .95 was achieved. Further, respondents provided strong initial evidence of the content validity of dimensions and tasks. Respondents collectively listed 457 tasks of 630 that could possibly have been

listed from 63 completed forms, each with ten dimensions, a 72.5% completion rate. These tasks strongly suggested that the original job analysis had acceptable content validity. Of the 457 tasks, 99% were associated with the same dimension that had emerged in the original form. This rate of agreement vastly exceeds the 60% to 70% acceptability standard usually accepted as part of the "retranslation method" (Smith & Kendall, 1963), by which job analysts commonly approximate a cross-validation of dimension and task associations.

In an extension of this earlier work, we reanalyze the data to delineate better the "essential" tasks associated with each of the eight essential or relevant dimensions. The reanalysis of data results in the development of a prototypical evaluation instrument(s) capable of adaptation by institution type and size, program type and size, budget, and/or personnel.

METHOD

Survey Instrument Design

A three-part questionnaire was constructed to assess the reliability and validity of the (1992) instrument. Part one identified the 10 dimensions and asked the respondents to rank, on a three-point Likert scale, how critical each dimension was in conducting their jobs (1= not essential, 2= moderately essential, and 3= essential), and list a task(s) associated with that dimension. Respondents were provided the opportunity to "write in" additional dimensions that they believed were essential to their jobs. To avoid the possibility of respondents falling into a "response set" (rating the tasks at the same level as the controlling dimension), tasks associated with the various dimensions were separated into their respective Knowledge, Skills, and Abilities categories and listed in part two.

Part two of the questionnaire addressed the different forms of Knowledge, Skills, Abilities, and Worker Characteristics. Respondents were asked to rate each of the tasks three times: once

for the importance of the item for job success (1 = minor importance for success, 2= average importance for success, and 3 = high importance for success); once for the difficulty associated with learning the task on the job (1 = easily learned, 2= average difficulty in learning, and 3= difficult to learn); and once for the importance of having this feature of the job on the first day of work (1= little importance, 2= average importance, and 3= high importance).

Part three of the questionnaire asked the respondents to provide demographic information about the type of institution (private; public, 2-year; and public, 4-year), size of institution, type of program (speech only, debate only, or some form of a joint program), and size of program (measured by number of participants, staffing, and travel budget).

Respondents

Surveys were mailed in the spring of 1993 to 210 forensic programs, representing both public and private institutions, of varying sizes, and all types of forensic programs. Forensic programs were selected from the mailing list generated for a joint speech and debate tournament with a national scope.

Five surveys were returned undeliverable or indicating that a program no longer existed at that institution. Sixty-three of the remaining 205 surveys were completed and returned for a response rate of 31%. (Although a 38% response rate was sought, the lower-than-expected return may be due to the timing of the survey. Surveys were mailed in mid-March with a response requested by early April. The timing of the survey conflicted with year-end travel to district and national tournaments.) Six coders were trained to transfer survey data to computer scantron sheets. A review of six surveys (approximately 10%) found an error rate of only .004 (.4%).

Data Analysis

The tasks were evaluated, using the mean (\bar{x}) scores of the responses, according to the following scale: tasks with means of 2.5 or greater (on a 3.0 scale) were considered "essential" tasks; tasks with means of 2.0-2.49 (on a 3.0 scale) were considered "relevant" tasks; and tasks with means below 2.0 (on a 3.0 scale) were considered "possible" tasks. Additionally, the data were analyzed for measurement reliability using Cronbach's alpha. Finally, analyses of variance (ANOVA) were conducted to determine if the tasks varied significantly by type of institution, size of institution, or type of program.

RESULTS

Twelve tasks achieved means (\bar{x}) of 2.5 or higher (on the 3.0 scale). The 12 "essential" tasks (\bar{x} of 2.5 or higher) of the DOF's position include (in rank order by mean): ability to build good working-group relations; knowledge of campus funding procedures; ability to improve participants' morale; willingness to travel to speech and debate tournaments on Fridays, Saturdays, and Sundays; skill at listening to student concerns; knowledge of rules regulating speech and debate competitions; ability to assess student proficiency in speech and debate classes; ability to formulate team goals; knowledge of national forensics rules and regulations; skill at safe driving; ability to conduct rehearsals; and ability to identify appropriate selections and topics for use in performances. Eleven "relevant" tasks (\bar{x} of 2.0-2.49) of the the DOF's position include (in rank order by mean): ability to motivate subordinates; knowledge of university bookkeeping procedures; knowledge of newspapers or periodicals used in speech and debate preparation; ability to match participants with competition events; ability to run speech and debate tournaments; skill at lecturing on speech and debate topics; skill at writing reports; knowledge of basic accounting principles; knowledge of university insurance procedures; knowledge of

university recruiting and admissions policies; and ability to drive different university-owned vehicles. The eleven remaining items scored less than 2.0 and are excluded from our discussion.

A compilation of dimensions and tasks results in the creation of two evaluation instruments: the standard evaluation form and the expanded evaluation form. The standard evaluation instrument consists of eight essential and relevant dimensions and 12 essential tasks (see Appendix A). An expanded evaluation model is offered. The combination of both essential and relevant dimensions and tasks produced the final product with eight dimensions and 23 tasks (see Appendix B).

As Table 2 indicates, data were provided by a wide range of respondents that were characterized by type and size of institution, and type and size of program. Approximately three-fourths (77%) of the respondents were affiliated with public institutions. More than 90% of the respondents represented institutions of at least 1,000 students.

Table 2: DEMOGRAPHICS*

1. Type of Institution		
A. private		14 (23%)
B. 2-year		6 (10%)
C. 4-year		40 (67%)
2. Size of Institution		
A. less than 1,000 students		5 (8%)
B. 1,001-5,000		19 (31%)
C. 5,001-10,000		12 (20%)
D. 10,001-20,000		15 (25%)
E. over 20,000		10 (16%)
3. Type of Program		
A. speech only		12 (20%)
B. speech with LD		5 (8%)
C. debate only		9 (15%)
D. both speech and debate		34 (57%)

4. Size of Program

A. 0-5	4 (7%)
B. 6-10	11 (19%)
C. 11-20	21 (36%)
D. 21-30	8 (13%)
E. 31-40	8 (13%)
F. over 40	7 (12%)

5. Program Staffing

Full-time programs	22 (35%)	70 Full time
Part-time programs	3 (5%)	27 Part-time
Graduate assistants only	2 (3%)	62 Grad
F-T and P-T programs	8 (13%)	
F-T and GTA	19 (30%)	6 Paid Assistants
F-T and Paid Assts.	5 (8%)	

6. Budgets (Travel) Range: \$2,500-\$70,000

17	under \$10,000
17	\$10,000-19,999
17	\$20,000-29,999
5	\$30,000-39,999
2	\$40,000-49,999
2	over \$50,000

*Demographic information reflects responses from 59-62 programs, as not all programs completed all information. One program left all of part three blank.

All types of programs were represented in this study. The majority of the programs (57%) were joint speech and debate programs. The types of debate included National Debate Tournament (NDT), Cross-Examination Debate Association (CEDA), Parliamentary, and Lincoln-Douglas (L-D). For purposes of tabulation, if a school identified itself either as "both debate (L-D) and speech" or as "speech only," but listed L-D debate, it was

classified as speech with L-D debate (a newly created category). The survey's original categorization scheme did not account for individual events programs that include L-D debate, as does the National Forensics Association's National Tournament. Speech-only programs comprised 20% of the sample, followed by debate-only programs (15%) and speech with L-D debate programs (8%).

The size of the program was measured using number of participants, staffing, and travel budget. Respondents represented programs of every size, as sizes ranged from "less than five" competitors (7%) to "over 40" competitors (12%). Various combinations of staffing existed in these programs. Staffing involved full-time faculty, part-time faculty, graduate teaching assistants, and paid assistants. Full-time staffs (35%), followed closely by joint full-time staffs with graduate teaching assistants (30%), comprised the predominant forms of staffing. The average staff size (165 total staff identified in 62 programs) was 2.66 members. Travel budgets varied greatly across program: budgets ranged from \$2,500 to \$70,000. The majority of the programs (55%) had travel budgets of less than \$20,000, and many respondents noted that their budgets were "not enough."

The reliability of the measures was assessed using Cronbach's alpha coefficient. A reliability score of .99 was achieved.

DISCUSSION

We described the development and initial validation of a job analysis for directors of forensics. A sample of current DOFs provides evidence that it is "essential," according to the results of this study, for the prototype for forensic evaluation to include the four dimensions of arranging students' participation in off-campus tournaments, administering the speech and debate program, coaching speech and debate participants, and accounting and bookkeeping. Forensic evaluation should also include the four "relevant" dimensions of recruiting students for speech and debate programs,

teaching speech and debate classes, directing on-campus tournaments, and counseling and advising speech and debate students. Finally, forensic evaluation may "possibly" include the two dimensions of college and community service involvement, and moderating speech and debate student groups. Twelve "essential" and eleven "relevant" tasks are arranged to form two possible evaluation instruments: the standard evaluation instrument and the expanded evaluation instrument.

Variations on the standard evaluation forms are possible and encouraged. Although tasks varied in importance by type of institution, size of program, number of participants, and budget, the greatest variability occurred between types of program. Debate-only programs in general rated knowledge of forensic rules and regulations, skill at listening to student concerns, ability to build good working-group relations, ability to conduct rehearsals, and ability to identify appropriate selections and topics for use in performances as less important than did individuals events (IE) programs and joint IE and debate programs. This may indicate the need for either separate evaluation forms for debate-only programs or altering the weightings of items within the standard form to reflect more accurately the demands of administering a debate-only forensics program.

Although "identification of appropriate selections and topics for use in performances" may understandably be less relevant to debate-only programs, the devaluation of "knowledge of rules and regulations," "ability to build good working-group relations," and "ability to conduct rehearsals" by debate-only programs is surprising. Perhaps additional forensic evaluation can be used to discover outcomes beyond intended results, as Sternhagen (1994) postulates. Future research should explore the functions that forensic evaluation can serve in improving educational practices.

Performance evaluation is only one aspect of human resources practice. The analyses we described can support three further applications to debate and forensic administration. First, the analyses suggest areas in which academic departments might

particularly focus selection and recruitment of DOFs. Search committees may use such scales to compare applicants. Since the scales were empirically derived and since different versions have shown transportability across institutional and program types, they offer legal defensibility for fair hiring decisions.

Second, the analyses provide a way to diagnose needs for faculty training. Ratings that assess a DOF's proficiency on tasks and dimensions could be an important developmental tool. Further, such ratings could be a part of an overall evaluation. The use of empirically-defined scales has provided business and industry with a mechanism for systematically gathering information from job incumbents, supervisors, peers, and subordinates. The same could be true for academics. A standardized measure, based on dimensions derived from job analysis, provides a tool for obtaining systematic input about a forensic program from students, faculty colleagues, coaches, and administrators. Educational assessment is increasingly important to legislatures and accreditors, and such input provides persuasive evidence of a program's or DOF's effectiveness to departmental or institutional administrators.

Despite the potential application and utility of the evaluation instruments, this study has limitations that subsequent research should address. The first limitation was the highly select sample that responded to the survey. The response rate of approximately 30%, although not unusual in survey-based research, is likely to produce a suboptimal sample.

The analysis suggests the adequacy of the identified dimensions of performance for the position of director of forensics, and almost all of the dimensions are independent of institutional or program type. Hence, the dimensions and the instrument are transportable and useful for purposes of assessment. However, further research should confirm that the consistency detected in the instrument is stable and not a byproduct of sampling bias, especially if the dimensions and tasks will be used for assessment of performance or selection.

Finally, although the evaluation form appears to be

generalizable to all types of programs in all types and sizes of institutions, each program must continue to personalize these dimensions and tasks by appropriate adaptation and weight so as to reflect accurately its mission and goals. Schnoor (1993) advocates, "We must take a look at what we are doing, why we are doing it, and how it fits with the overall mission and goals of our sponsoring educational institutions" (p. 7). His sentiments are echoed by the Working Committee from the Quail Roost Conference on Assessment of Professional Activities of Directors of Debate that declared the "basis for evaluation should be grounded explicitly in the mission statements of the institution, department, and debate program" (AFA Policy, 1993, p. 1). The dissemination, personalization, and utilization of these forensic evaluation instruments offer administrators and DOFs alike an evaluative tool for the activity we call forensics.

ENDNOTE

¹In earlier reports (1992), the eight dimensions were delineated into five "essential" dimensions and three "relevant" dimensions. Upon elimination of some uncodeable responses, a recalculation of dimensions revealed that "recruiting students for the speech and debate program" mean fell from 2.55 to 2.45. The recalculation did not change any other dimension, nor did it change the composition of the overall eight dimensions.

REFERENCES

AFA Policy Debate Caucus. (1993). *Report of the working committee from the Quail Roost Conference on assessment of professional activities of directors of debate*. Draft document.

- Albert, L. S. (1991). *Forensics as scholarly activity from the administrative perspective*. (Contract No. CS-507-682). Washington, DC: National Institute of Education.
- Alexander, B. K. (1993, November). *Evaluating program administration: Looking out, looking in: An evaluation of selection procedures*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Miami, FL.
- Baehr, M. E., Lonergan, W. G., & Hunt, B. A. (1988). *The managerial and professional job functions inventory*. Park Ridge: London House, Inc.
- Boileau, D. M. (1990). The role of department chair as forensics promoter. *National Forensics Journal*, 8, 87-94.
- Definitional statement. (1974). *Forensics as communication: The argumentative perspective* (pp. 11-49). Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association.
- Dudczak, C. A. (1985). *Philosophy and reality at a research university*. (Contract No. CS-505-097). Washington, DC: National Institute of Education.
- Dudczak, C. A., & Zarefsky, D. (1984). Promotions and tenure standards. In D. Parson (Ed.) *American Forensics in Perspective: Papers from the Second National Conference on Forensics* (pp. 23-35). Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association.
- Hollwitz, J., & Danielson, M. A. (1992). Industrial assessment in higher education: Applying job analysis to faculty and administrative performance. In T. W. Banta and Anderson (Eds.) *Proceedings of the Fourth International Conference on Assessing Quality in Higher Education* (pp. 361-372). Indianapolis, IN: Indiana University-Purdue University at Indianapolis.
- Schnoor, L. (1993, November). *Assessing the university individual event program*. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Miami, FL.

- Smith, P. C, & Kendall, L. M. (1963). Retranslation of expectations: An approach to the construction of unambiguous anchors for rating scales. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 47*, 149-155.
- Sternhagen, F. (1994, October 3). *Forensic program evaluation efforts*. Electronic mail transmission.
- Uniform guidelines on employee selection procedures. (1978). *Federal Register, 43*, 38290-38315.

**Appendix A Standard
Evaluation Form***

___ ARRANGING STUDENTS' PARTICIPATION IN
OFF-CAMPUS TOURNAMENTS

- skill at safe driving
- willingness to travel to speech and debate tournaments on
Fridays, Saturdays, and Sundays

_____ADMINISTERING SPEECH AND DEBATE PROGRAM

- knowledge of national forensics rules and regulations
- ability to formulate team goals

___ COACHING SPEECH AND DEBATE PARTICIPANTS

- knowledge of rules regulating speech and debate competitions
- ability to conduct rehearsals
- ability to identify appropriate selections and topics for use in
performance
- ability to build good working-group relations

_____ACCOUNTING AND BOOKKEEPING

- knowledge of campus funding procedures

_____RECRUITING STUDENTS FOR THE SPEECH AND
DEBATE PROGRAM

_____TEACHING A SPEECH AND DEBATE CLASS

- ability to assess student proficiency in speech and debate classes

___ DIRECTING ON-CAMPUS TOURNAMENTS

___ COUNSELING AND ADVISING SPEECH AND DEBATE
STUDENTS

- skill at listening to student concerns
- ability to improve participants' morale

**Appendix B Expanded
Evaluation Form***

___ ARRANGING STUDENTS' PARTICIPATION IN
OFF-CAMPUS TOURNAMENTS

- skill at safe driving
- ability to drive different university-owned vehicles
- willingness to travel to speech and debate tournaments on
Fridays, Saturdays, and Sundays

___ ADMINISTERING THE SPEECH AND DEBATE
PROGRAM

- knowledge of national forensics rules and regulations
- knowledge of university insurance procedures
- skill at writing reports
- ability to formulate team goals
- ability to motivate subordinates

___ COACHING SPEECH AND DEBATE PARTICIPANTS

- knowledge of rules regulating speech and debate competitions
- knowledge of newspapers or periodicals used in speech and
debate preparation
- ability to conduct rehearsals
- ability to identify appropriate selections and topics for use in
performance
- ability to match participants with competition events
- ability to build good working-group relations

___ ACCOUNTING AND BOOKKEEPING

- knowledge of campus funding procedures
- knowledge of university bookkeeping procedures
- knowledge of basic accounting principles

_____ RECRUITING STUDENTS FOR THE SPEECH AND
DEBATE PROGRAM

—knowledge of university recruiting and admissions policies

____ TEACHING A SPEECH AND DEBATE CLASS

—skill at lecturing on speech and debate topics

—ability to assess student proficiency in speech and debate classes

_____ DIRECTING ON-CAMPUS TOURNAMENTS

—ability to run speech and debate tournaments

____ COUNSELING AND ADVISING SPEECH AND DEBATE
STUDENTS

—skill at listening to student concerns

—ability to improve participants' morale

*NOTE: Evaluation forms list dimensions and tasks only. We recommend that all evaluation items be evaluated via program, departmental, and university mission statements; that programs individualize the forms through adaptation of items and weightings of tasks and dimensions; and that this form be used in combination with other university forms and methods for faculty evaluation.

Gender as a Predictor of Competitive Success in Extemporaneous Speaking

Leah E. White

Leah White (M.A., Kansas State U, 1993) is a doctoral candidate in speech communication at Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ 85287-1205. An earlier version of this essay was presented at the 1996 SCA Convention, San Diego, CA.

In an intriguing discussion of the parallels between competitive extemporaneous speaking and presidential address, Aden (1992) suggested that students have much to learn from recognizing the similarities between these two forms of speaking. Ironically, he neglected an important similarity between extemporaneous speaking and presidential address: the obvious lack of women participants. Although he made some interesting observations concerning how the choices a student makes when preparing an extemporaneous speech tend to mirror choices made by a president when preparing a briefing on a political issue, Aden's analogy backfires in that it perpetuates the assumption that extemporaneous speaking is a male dominated event. Just as few women have had the opportunity to run for the presidency, few women have experienced the joy of competitive success in extemporaneous speaking.

Murphy (1989) observed that although equal gender representation in forensic events has been a goal discussed at both National Developmental Conferences on Forensics, little has been accomplished to help the forensic community reach this goal. Manchester and Friedley (1985) attempted to draw attention to the problem of gender inequality in forensics, but unfortunately ten years after they presented their startling study many of the same problems they identified are still present. The goal of this paper is to examine the lack of women's participating and succeeding in intercollegiate extemporaneous speaking.

In order to understand this problem, the results of Manchester and Friedley's (1985) study will be reviewed and national out-round participants at both the American Forensic Association's National Individual Events Tournament and the

National Forensic Association's Individual Events Nationals from the years 1990-1996 will be examined. Once this data has been reviewed, I shall offer possible reasons that explain the gender discrepancy and suggest potential solutions to this problem.

The results of Manchester and Friedley's (1985) analysis of male and female participation and success at national tournaments are surprising, if not disheartening. Their analysis of the AFA and NFA 1985 national tournaments found that overall participation at the national tournaments was roughly equal, with 52% of participants being male and the remaining 47% female. However, participants' overall success illustrated an imbalance between genders: 58% of all quarter-finalists were male, whereas 42% were female. The gap grew larger when one considers that 61 % of semi-finalists were male and only 39% were female. The percentages for final round participants also illustrated gender inequality: 63% of finalists were male and only 37% were female, or 47 of the 126 finalists were women.

Manchester and Friedley (1985) found that the largest discrepancy between male and female competitors was apparent in the limited preparation events. 63% of the 1985 quarter-finalists in extemporaneous speaking and impromptu speaking were men, whereas only 37% were female. The number of women in semi-finals dropped to 30% while 70% of the competitors were male (Manchester & Friedley, 1985). The most significant gap was in the final rounds where 79% of the participants were male and only 21 % were female. When Manchester and Friedley compared these figures to other public address results, where 54% of the finalists were male and 46% were female, the discrepancy in limited preparation events is readily apparent.

Based on Manchester and Friedley's initial findings, this study seeks to test the following two hypotheses:

H1: Biological sex is a predictor of the level of success experienced in persuasive speaking.

H2: Biological sex is a predictor of the level of success experienced in extemporaneous speaking.

In an attempt to understand the gender discrepancy present in extemporaneous speaking, the American Forensic Association National Tournament and the National Forensic Association National Tournament results for extemporaneous speaking will be compared to the results for persuasive speaking. Persuasive speaking was selected as a comparative event for three reasons. Initially, Manchester and Friedley (1985) found that the gender discrepancy in the platform events was not nearly as pronounced as it was in the limited preparations events. Additionally, of the four platform events, persuasive speaking is the most similar to extemporaneous speaking in terms of its focus on argumentation. Finally, Murphy (1989) identified persuasive speaking as the public speaking event where women had experienced significant success. Hopefully, an analysis of both events will explain why so few women succeed in extemporaneous speaking.

METHODOLOGY

Data for this study were collected through a close analysis of the tournament results tabulation sheets from the AFA and NFA national tournaments. These tabulation sheets are carefully prepared by tab room staff members, and thus provide the most easily accessible and accurate report of results of the national tournaments. The AFA and NFA national tournaments were selected as sources for the data because these two tournaments are used by the forensics community to measure individual and team success for each competitive season. Because all students must qualify to attend the AFA and NFA national tournaments, they have attained a level of competitive success prior to attending the national tournaments. Additionally, these national tournaments are not limited to participants from specific geographical regions, for competitors and judges from all competitive districts in the nation attend the AFA and NFA national tournaments. Consequently, these two national tournaments are representative of the regional tournaments held earlier in the year.

Three AFA national tournaments and two NFA national tournaments were selected for analysis. Because Manchester and Friedley's (1985) earlier study identified a gender discrepancy problem in the 1980s, this study determines if this discrepancy continued into the next decade; thus, all five tournaments selected for analysis in this study occurred between 1991 and 1996. The 1,345 students entered in persuasive speaking and extemporaneous speaking at the five selected tournaments were each considered as individual cases in the study. As each event entry was recorded, information regarding the contestant's sex and success at the tournament was also recorded. Sex was indicated by the contestant's first name, and success was measured as a contestant's ability either to advance or not to advance to each of the three elimination rounds.

This measure of competitive success was highly reliable because the AFA and NFA national tournaments utilize strict rules to determine which individuals advance into the elimination rounds. These rules are consistently followed every year; thus, the success of each of the contestants from each of the five selected tournaments included in this study was measured in an accurate and consistent manner. Although competitive success was easily determined, sex was sometimes difficult to identify. Utilizing first names as indicators of sex presented a weakness in reliability when confronted with an ambiguous first name, such as "Jamie." In such situations, attempts were made, through the consultation of other members in the forensic community, to identify properly each contestant's sex. Unfortunately, in 72 cases this information was unavailable. However, the 72 cases were contestants who did not advance to elimination rounds; thus, although the study was somewhat weakened by missing cases, their impact was minimal, and these cases were deleted from the analysis.

RESULTS

The hypothesis was that sex is a predictor of competitive success in extemporaneous and persuasive speaking events. Basic

frequencies and Chi square analysis were used to test the proposed hypotheses.

Initially, frequencies demonstrated that the total number of men and women entered in both extemporaneous speaking and persuasive speaking combined was almost equal. As shown in Table 1, of the 1,273 contestants entered in extemporaneous and persuasive speaking in the five analyzed tournaments, 633 were male and 640 were female. Thus establishing a near 50% split between men and women. A similar split was also found when the total number of entries was divided by event. Table 2 shows that extemporaneous speaking and persuasive speaking were almost equally as popular, with 630 students entered in extemporaneous and 643 entered in persuasive.

TABLE 1
Frequency of Total Entries by Biological Sex

Event	Frequency	% of Total Entries
Male	633	49.7%
Female	640	50.3%

TABLE 2
Frequency of Total Entries by Event

Event	Frequency	% of Total Entries
Extemporaneous	630	49.5%
Persuasive	643	50.5%

Although the frequency of total men and women entered, and the number of entries within each event were almost equal, a rather large discrepancy is found when the number of men and women

entered in each separate event was analyzed. The frequencies, as reported in Table 3, illustrate that more men qualified for the national tournaments in extemporaneous speaking, and more women qualified for the tournaments in persuasive speaking. These differences are significant, with almost twice as many men entered in extemporaneous speaking than women, and nearly twice as many women entered in persuasive speaking than men. A Pearson Chi square analysis supported the significance of this discrepancy. When sex was tested against type of event, the resulting Chi square value was 94.56, with a significance of $p < .00000$ at the .05 level. Clearly, sex may predict whether a contestant will enter in extemporaneous or persuasive speaking.

Table 3
Frequency of Entries in Each Event by Biological Sex

Sex	Event	Frequency	% of Total Event Entry
Male	Extemporaneous	400	63%
Female	Extemporaneous	230	37%
Male	Persuasive	233	36%
Female	Persuasive	410	64%

Although a discrepancy existed between the number of men and women entered in each separate event, one should note that the percentage of men entered in each event who advanced to elimination rounds is still higher than the percentage of women who advanced. This is true regardless of the number of total men entered in each event. Tables 4, 5 and 6 show the number of students who advanced to each of the three elimination rounds in extemporaneous and persuasive speaking. When looking at the percentage of those entered in each event, it is clear that even though nearly twice as

many women were entered in persuasive speaking, the percentage of men entered who advanced is still larger than the percentage of women entered who advanced. Although this incongruity occurs in both events, it is most apparent in extemporaneous speaking.

The inequality in the number of men and women advancing to elimination rounds in extemporaneous speaking is further illustrated when one examines the percentages of all the competitors advancing to elimination rounds. Tables 4, 5, and 6 clearly show that the percentage of male students who advanced to elimination rounds in extemporaneous speaking was significantly higher than the percentage of female students who advanced. This is most dramatically seen when looking at the percentage of students advancing to the final round of extemporaneous speaking, for only 4 students, or 13%, were women.

Table 4
Contestants Advancing to the Quarter-Final Round

Sex	Event	# of Contestants Advancing	% of Contestants Entered	% of all Advancing
Male	Extemp	92	23%	77%
Female	Extemp	28	12%	23%
Male	Persuasive	51	22%	42%
Female	Persuasive	69	17%	58%

Table 5
Contestants Advancing to the Semi-Final Round

Sex	Event	# of Contestants Advancing	% of Contestants Entered	% of all Advancing
Male	Extemp	50	13%	82%
Female	Extemp	11	5%	18%
Male	Persuasive	29	12%	48%
Female	Persuasive	31	8%	52%

Table 6
Contestants Advancing to the Final Round

Sex	Event	# of Contestants Advancing	% of Contestants Entered	% of all Advancing
Male	Extemp	26	7%	87%
Female	Extemp	4	2%	13%
Male	Persuasive	15	6%	50%
Female	Persuasive	15	4%	50%

The discrepancy was not nearly as noticeable in the results generated for persuasive speaking. Of the total number of students advancing to elimination rounds in persuasive speaking, women demonstrated a slight advantage in the quarter-final and semi-final rounds. However, once students reached the final round, women equaled men, for 50% were men and the other 50% were women.

Although this examination of frequencies provides information in support of the hypothesis that sex may be a predictor of success in some competitive speaking events, further analysis was

necessary. Thus, Pearson Chi square analysis was utilized. Because tests were run examining the number of students advancing to the quarter-final, semi-final and final rounds, the .05 confidence interval was divided by 3 resulting in a significance level of .0167. The Chi square analysis utilized event and sex as independent variables, and level of success as the dependent variable. Table 7 reports the results of the Chi square analysis. These results did not support hypothesis 1 that sex is a predictor of competitive success in persuasive speaking. However, hypothesis 2, that sex is a predictor of competitive success in extemporaneous speaking, was supported with significant results at each level of competitive success. Therefore, these results indicated that a male speaker is much more likely to experience success in extemporaneous speaking than is a female speaker.

Table 7
Results of Pearson Chi Square Analysis ($p < .0167$)

Event	Level of Success	Chi Square Value	Degrees of Freedom	Significance
Extemp	Quarter	11.09992	1	.00086
Extemp	Semi	9.94552	1	.00161
Extemp	Final	7.29841	1	.00690
Persuasive	Quarter	2.50508	1	.11348
Persuasive	Semi	4.19109	1	.04064
Persuasive	Finals	2.57999	1	.10822

The results clearly indicate an imbalance between male and female participants in the elimination rounds of extemporaneous speaking. Unlike persuasive speaking where the imbalance is not severe, males consistently dominate extemporaneous speaking. In order to understand reasons for why this discrepancy occurs, I shall

review the characteristics of these two events and the current literature that discusses gender differences in speaking styles. An overview of this literature can identify possible explanations for why women are not equally represented in extemporaneous speaking national elimination rounds.

DISCUSSION

Extemporaneous speaking has several specific characteristics. Aden and Kay (1988) explained that success in extemporaneous speaking "requires contestants to understand complicated subjects of worldly importance, to analyze and synthesize, and to display their intellectual wares by powerfully and persuasively presenting their judgments to a myriad of critical listeners" (p. 43). The criteria of pertinence, synthesis of information, and powerful delivery are valued characteristics in an extemporaneous speech. Aden and Kay (1988) added that logical organization, focused analysis, and an argumentative approach were also important aspects of extemporaneous speaking. Agreeing with Aden and Kay (1988), Crawford's (1984) discussion of standardizing the topic displayed a value for well developed organization in extemporaneous speeches and Crawford specifically called for a formulaic approach to the event.

Benson (1978) addressed the issue of acceptable organizational patterns for extemporaneous speeches. He argued that the "primary objectives of an extemporaneous speech are to demonstrate the speaker's ability to synthesize information and to reason validly" (Benson, 1978, p. 150). Benson's (1978) criteria of synthesis and reasoning are consistent with those criteria outlined by Aden and Kay (1988). Additionally his value for organization compliments Crawford's (1984) discussion. In summary, the literature identifies complex understanding, solid analysis, complete synthesis, powerful delivery, argumentativeness, valid reasoning, and impeccable organization as characteristics of a strong extemporaneous speech.

The literature concerning criteria for evaluating effective persuasive speeches identifies several characteristics unique to this genre of speaking. Benson and Friedley (1982) provided a comprehensive list of criteria, which several coaches identified as necessary in the development of a successful persuasive speech. Although their study proved that various audiences will value each of these criteria differently, all of the criteria were considered important. Initially, Benson and Friedley (1982) explained that a successful persuasive speech must establish a significant problem and also provide information concerning how this problem relates to an audience. Judges value clarity of organization, and they reward the problem-solution format. Although the quantity of evidence is important in a persuasive speech, Benson and Friedley (1982) stressed the need for quality evidence, and a balance between emotional and logical evidence was expected. Judges also valued well developed and workable solutions, which appeal to audience's needs, and they expected a sincere yet conversational delivery.

Sellnow and Ziegelmüller (1988) added to this list of criteria for evaluating persuasive speeches. After reviewing several years of successful speeches at the Interstate Oratory Contest, Sellnow and Ziegelmüller (1988) identified four specific areas that are unique to all of the analyzed speeches. Initially, they found that many early persuasive speeches used the tactic of personal relevancy as a way to develop speaker credibility. Personal relevancy is established in a speech when the speaker explains how he or she or the audience has been, or could be, directly affected by the problem discussed in the persuasive speech. The second general area is the use of evocative or logical support material. The recent trend has been to move away from using evocative support material in favor of more logical forms. Documentation is the third area. Documentation has always been valued in successful speeches, even though in recent years the amount of documentation has increased. Finally, a workable solution is also present in most successful persuasive speeches. Although Sellnow and Ziegelmüller's study demonstrated a move in persuasive speaking toward a more logical

and less personal form, persuasive speaking has been traditionally viewed as a speech ripe with personal involvement and emotional influence.

Now that the characteristics of extemporaneous and persuasive speaking have been identified, a brief overview of literature concerning gender differences may help to identify if the characteristics of either of these speaking events are more conducive to a masculine or a feminine communication style.

Initially, in an analysis of masculine and feminine language differences in public speaking situations, Mulac, Lundell and Bradac (1986) reported several gender differences. They found that male public speakers use linguistic features that "suggest a relatively egocentric orientation" (Mulac et.al., 1986, p. 123), which means the use of first person singular pronouns. Men also tend to focus their language on the present rather than on the past or future. Additionally, they found that male speakers use many active verbs, tend to make several grammatical errors, and possess a high desire to control a discussion. Mulac et.al. (1986) characterized women's communication patterns in public speaking situations as complex, formal, and occasionally tentative; additionally, women often make references to emotions and use intense adverbs.

Andrews (1987) also examined gender differences in communication styles. Specifically, she focused on gender differences in persuasive speaking situations. On a general level, Andrews found that women tend to express lower levels of self-confidence than men. Whereas men often attribute their communicative success to their own natural abilities, women credit their own effort. In terms of persuasive argumentation, Andrews found that men often use criterion based arguments that can be directly linked to the persuasive situation at hand. Women, however, are more prone to create their own criteria, which means a woman may look for explanations that are outside the immediate boundaries of the argument at hand. For instance, females may prefer to refer to possible exceptions rather than the actual evidence apparent in the argument. Andrews (1987) also found that both men

and women perceive women to be "more devoted to community and societal concerns than men" (p. 383).

Feminist critics also discussed possible differences between masculine and feminine communication styles. Campbell classified feminine communication as inductive, based in personal experience, laden with the use of examples and opposed to objectivity and power (as cited in Murphy, 1989). Foss and Foss (1991) argued that "women have an eloquence of their own, manifest in a variety of contexts and forms" (p. 2). They specifically focused on the need for scholars of public address to value alternative contexts of speaking that may be more conducive to the female experience. In summary, Murphy (1989) argued that "feminist literary critics are beginning to identify a style of communication traditionally female, one based on personal revelations, examples and women's own symbols and experiences" (p. 121).

When discussing gender differences in communication styles, one should understand that most of what is believed to be true about male and female communication traits is rooted in what society has dictated as acceptable behavior for men and women. Kramer (1974) referred to such societal expectations as "folk linguistics" or those unwritten rules about gender roles. Kramer (1974) wrote:

there seems to be a conflict not only between what women's speech really is like and what people think women's speech really is like, but also between what people think women's speech is like and what they think it should be like (p. 17).

She cited several examples of what people think women's speech "should" be like. For instance, women should not speak as much as men, they should use fewer declarative sentences, and they should rarely state an opinion directly. Kramer (1974) specifically cited the female's higher pitched voice quality as a possible reason why society often does not listen to women's voices in public settings. She cited a quotation from a broadcaster stating, "As a whole, people don't like to hear women's voices telling them serious things" (Kramer, 1974, p. 19). Kramer's (1974) discussion of how society

views the feminine communication style is a reminder that the identified differences between male and female styles are often based in society's perceptions of what men and women should be like. Essentially, differences in communication style are more differences in gender traits than in actual biological make-up.

Since perceived gender differences in communication styles are socially created, one could not expect the forensic community to be immune to such social pressures. Therefore, in order to understand why women are not nationally successful in extemporaneous speaking, the characteristics of extemporaneous and persuasive speaking should be compared to what are considered acceptable feminine and masculine communication styles. Such a comparison may reveal that women are not as successful as men in extemporaneous speaking, because this speaking activity violates the socially approved feminine speaking style.

When comparing the literature reviewed concerning characteristics of extemporaneous and persuasive speaking with the literature concerning gender differences in communication styles, connections between the two are easily made. The characteristics of extemporaneous speaking parallel many masculine communication traits. A highly confident, criterion based, argumentative, objective, and deductive masculine style works well with the analytical, formulaic, carefully reasoned and synthesized, clearly organized, and powerfully delivered extemporaneous speech. However, the feminine style, inductive reasoning, use of personal experience, and a tentative approach does not meet the criteria for a successful extemporaneous speech.

However, the feminine communication style is appropriately matched to the characteristics of a successful persuasive speech. The feminine style of using evidence based on personal experience is similar to the use of evocative supporting material in a persuasive speech. The feminine style of using non-criterion based arguments is conducive to the more personal approach of the persuasive speech. Perhaps most significant is Andrews's (1987) observation that women are perceived to be more concerned about community and

societal welfare than are men. Certainly such a perception would add to a female's enhanced credibility when advocating a solution to a societal problem.

Although a connection exists between event characteristics and masculine and feminine communication styles, the question still remains: "Why are men nearly equally as successful as women in an event that seems to call for a 'feminine' style, but women do not experience this same success when competing in an event that calls for a 'masculine' style?"

Researchers have proposed two possible answers. Murphy (1989) argued that women must struggle to succeed in all public address events, because these events are rooted in a standard of rationality, and as such the "traditional standards for evaluation favor masculine communication styles" (p. 115). Therefore, even though persuasive speaking allows for a more personal and less rigid approach, the argumentative core of the problem-solution format is still deeply rooted in the rational paradigm. Thus, one could argue that persuasive speaking is not a feminine form of speaking, but rather is a *less masculine* format than extemporaneous speaking. Manchester and Friedley (1985) offered an alternative explanation. They suggested that in our society men receive rewards when they violate sex role expectations and stereotypes, whereas women rarely receive such rewards. Consequently, few women feel comfortable violating their expected roles. Manchester and Friedley's (1985) argument helps to explain why women are rarely positively rated in extemporaneous elimination rounds. Their low level of success may be due to judge's unwillingness to accept women's gender role violations. Such a hostile environment may intimidate many women from even competing in extemporaneous speaking, for such women may turn to other public address events that, although they may not be ideally suited to their communicative style, welcome alternative approaches.

Identifying specific reasons why women do not experience success in extemporaneous speaking at national tournaments will take more study. However, steps can be taken to prevent this gender

discrepancy from continuing. Initially, alternatives to the current form of extemporaneous speaking should be considered. In his article addressing how to create a gender balanced curriculum, Peterson (1991) argued that in order to have any influence on gender bias in an academic setting, changes in the curriculum must be made. Such an approach should also be encouraged in forensics. Changes need to be made in the forensic curriculum, which means that forensic educators should discuss possible alterations in the format of events that are susceptible to gender bias. For instance, judges could admit a less standardized approach to extemporaneous speaking that would help to eliminate its dependence on the rational world paradigm (Murphy, 1989). Judges could allow a place for narrative and example, along with logical reasoning and evidence, as acceptable support material in an extemporaneous speech in order to make the event more palatable to the feminine communication style. Judges might consider another alternative in extemporaneous speaking: Permit students to use an inductive approach to answering the proposed question rather than the traditional deductive approach. This change would accommodate other forms of reasoning, which could be educationally beneficial for all students regardless of their communicative style.

Changes must also be made on a personal level. Coaches and judges need to re-evaluate their own policies and positions to determine if they are doing anything to contribute to gender bias in forensic competition. In their discussion of tactics to enhance gender sensitivity in communication classes, Wood and Lenze (1991) explained that self-evaluation is a highly effective and low risk agent of change, for self-evaluation "tends to be most successful when instructors focus on one or two specific behaviors at a time, rather than trying to monitor simultaneously all behaviors related to gender sensitivity" (p. 20). For example, a coach could spend several weeks monitoring the comments he/she writes on ballots, in order to determine if his/her criteria for evaluation in any events are perpetuating bias. Finally, forensic competitors need to change their attitudes. Clearly, more women need to be encouraged to participate

in extemporaneous speaking, and they need support if their participation leads to initial failure.

Future research should investigate the culture of the extemporaneous preparation room to ascertain if this culture is in any way hostile to female competitors. Interviews with current and past female competitors could shed light on an aspect of extemporaneous speaking that coaches are unable to experience. Research also needs to be conducted to determine the role judges play in perpetuating this problem. Are females adequately represented as judges on elimination round panels? If not, what actions need to be taken to change this lack of representation? Further, research is needed to ascertain if the sex of the judge has an effect on how he/she evaluates male and female students. For example, do male judges evaluate male competitors differently than female competitors in extemporaneous speaking? Steps need to be taken to identify and to stop any judging behaviors that make this disturbing discrepancy possible.

Change rarely happens immediately, but the forensic community has known about the problem in extemporaneous speaking for over ten years. Proactive measures should be taken now to prevent future gender discrepancies in any of the individual events sponsored by the National Forensic Association.

REFERENCES

- Aden, R. C. (1992). Making rhetorical choices: The parallel between extemporaneous and presidential speaking. *Argumentation and Advocacy*, 28, 178-184.
- Aden, R. C. & Kay, J. (1988). Improving the educational value of extemporaneous speaking: Refocusing the question. *The National Forensic Journal*, 6, 43-50.
- Andrews, P. H. (1987). Gender differences in persuasive communication and attribution of success and failure. *Human Communication Research*, 13, 372-385.

- Benson, J. A. (1978). Extemporaneous speaking: Organization which inheres. *The Journal of the American Forensic Association, 14*, 150-155.
- Benson, J. A. & Friedley, S. A. (1982). An empirical analysis of evaluation criteria for persuasive speaking. *The Journal of the American Forensic Association, 19*, 1-13.
- Crawford, J. E. (1984). Toward a standardized extemporaneous speech competition: Tournament design and speech training. *The National Forensic Journal, 2*, 41-55.
- Foss, K. A. & Foss, S. K. (1991). *Women speak: The eloquence of women's lives*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland.
- Kramer, C. (1974). Women's speech: Separate but unequal? *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 60*, 14-24.
- Manchester, B. B., & Friedley, S. A. (1985). *Male/female levels of participation in regional and national individual events tournaments*. Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association Convention, Denver, Co.
- Mulac, A., Lundell, T. L., & Bradac, J. J. (1986). Male/female language differences and attributional consequences in a public speaking situation: Toward an explanation of the gender-linked language effect. *Communication Monographs, 53*, 115-129.
- Murphy, J. M. (1989). Separate and unequal: Women in the public address events. *The National Forensic Journal, 1*, 115-125.
- Peterson, E. E. (1991). Moving toward a gender balanced curriculum in basic speech communication courses. *Communication Education, 40*, 60-72.
- Sellnow, T. L. & Ziegelmueller, G. (1988). The persuasive speaking contests: An analysis of twenty years of change. *The National Forensic Journal, 6*, 75-88.
- Wood, J. T. & Lenze, L. F. (1991). Strategies to enhance gender sensitivity in communication education. *Communication Education, 40*, 16-21.

Lincoln-Douglas Debate: Inherency Revisited

Robert A. Abrams and Carolyn Lumsden Novak

Robert Abrams (MA, Indiana U, 1996) is debate coach at Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA 70803 and Carolyn Novak (BA, Kean College, 1995) is assistant director of forensics at Indiana University, Bloomington, IN 47405.

The rich diversity of the forensic community, complimented by the wide range of individual events, creates broad boundaries of situational expectations. Grounded in particular theoretical and pedagogical conventions, the community delineates certain acceptable and unacceptable appropriations of those conventions. Whether the use of the black book in interpretation events, bookends in a limited preparation speech, or standard transitional movements in public address, regular expectations situate the individual performance.

The NFA's Lincoln-Douglas debate is no exception. Grounded in the stock issues paradigm, L-D debate entails similar pedagogical and theoretical conventions. The rules of engagement associated with this paradigm attempt to create an educational environment for the competitors, judges, and audience members.

STOCK ISSUES

Based on the Roman law court's utilization of certain stock questions when trying a criminal case, the stock issues paradigm evolved into the current form used in academic debate.¹ Although various authors present these issues differently, the preponderance of writers and theorists require the affirmative to satisfy four stock issues in the prima facie case.²

1. Harm: The affirmative must demonstrate a compelling need.
2. Inherency: The affirmative must demonstrate that the status quo cannot solve the problem.
3. Solvency: The affirmative must demonstrate that its plan can solve the need.
4. Advantage: The affirmative must demonstrate its plan will accrue benefits that outweigh any disadvantage(s) caused by the implementation of the affirmative plan.

The stock issues paradigm provides a rigid set of issues on which to debate. In promoting debate on these central issues, the paradigm presents "a sort of checklist for both debaters and judges,"³ as these issues indicate how the affirmative and the negative must argue in order to win the round.⁴ The affirmative must win all of the stock issues in order to change the negative presumption, while the negative needs only to win one of the stock issues to maintain the presumption against change.⁵

One of the critical components of the stock issues paradigm is inherency. We believe a theoretical understanding of inherency by the increasingly diversified community of competitors and judges in NFA L-D debate is quintessential to the activity's pedagogical function. Although a surfeit of articles has been published on the theoretical implications of various forms of inherency, to the authors' knowledge, no literature exists evaluating inherency specifically within NFA's Lincoln-Douglas debate and the stock issues paradigm. Because L-D debate began and continues to cling to pedagogical principles distinct from NDT and CEDA debate, a contextual evaluation of inherency is warranted. Offering both a survey of existing literature and a theoretical examination of various forms of inherency arguments, this paper attempts to ground the community's evaluation of inherency within the stock issues paradigm generally and NFA L-D debate specifically.

The stock issues paradigm posits that particular issues are inherent in the nature of policy propositions. Harpine asserts "Thus, the human beings seeking to reach a policy decision do not, according to this widely held opinion, contribute their own viewpoints, ideals, desires, or needs to the debate except in relationship to inescapable, objective issues."⁶ In presenting the pedagogy of the stock issues paradigm, Harpine reveals the importance of placing primary emphasis on certain objective standards. By providing several critical issues that must be met by an affirmative in a debate round, the stock issues paradigm sets the rules of engagement within that debate. Those rules provide the foreground for an environment that teaches the skills of effective argumentation rather than argumentation that rests primarily on preconceived beliefs. Stock issues are inseparable from the historical context and the statement of the resolution, and they represent the

logical obligations of the advocate of change.⁷ Stock issues help define the "rules of engagement" for the debaters' encounter and they set the parameters for various argumentative strategies, such as counterplans, minor repairs, and disadvantages.

Because we consider debate to be primarily a pedagogical activity, the rules of engagement have important implications. By forcing debaters to work within certain parameters, the stock issues paradigm situates debaters in a mutually agreed upon argumentative realm. Within that framework, debaters cultivate better reasoning skills, learn more about the strategic engagement of issues, and focus more attention on developing and refuting arguments rather than relying on "cards" to make their points. In fact the NFA L-D community was born as a reaction to the fast, cursory "spread" style debate rewarded in NDT, and more recently, in CEDA debate. Last year's new rule regarding speed was another step in protecting the activity from tendencies to sacrifice quality of argument for the sake of superficial depth.

NFA L-D debate remains the only form of national debate that mandates a particular paradigm to adjudicate a round. Although at least one small cross-section of NDT debate schools, the American Debate Association (ADA), mandates certain rules for engagement (e.g., topicality is a voting issue), no organization features one particular paradigm for educational purposes. In both CEDA and NDT debates, one commonly hears that topicality, inherency, and other stock issues are at best secondary and at worst irrelevant. Teaching debate through the lens of the stock issues paradigm, NFA L-D highlights a particular argumentative process. From its point of educational codification, L-D debate prizes the pedagogical value derived from rigorous argumentative inquiry. Various stock issues, such as topicality, solvency, inherency, are as important, if not more important, than the subject matter being debated.

NFA's mandate of the stock issues paradigm in L-D teaches a valuable argumentative process. Inherency is an integral part of that process that forces debaters to look at issues of causality. Establishing the link between the ills of the status quo and the cause(s) of those problems, inherency requires the debater to demonstrate a logical connection between societal failings and the affirmative plan. Students are forced to assess what is wrong, when

and where the problem emerged, how it should be changed, and who or what is responsible for it. Inherency provides the justification for action by demarcating the "guilt" of the status quo vis-a-vis the problem area that the affirmative defines.

Debaters who fail to complete such a well-rounded indictment of the status quo's policy often present piecemeal solutions. This inhibits a debater's ability to learn substantially from the status quo's shortcomings and it hinders the necessary argumentative thought process to correct those failings. One of our roles as educators is to encourage clear and complete analysis, and the stock issues paradigm is one important way that intercollegiate debate helps us to teach these goals.

THE KINDS OF INHERENCY

Historically, inherency has been divided into two kinds, structural and attitudinal barriers.⁸ A structural barrier is the absence of the mechanism needed to implement or create the desired policy.⁹ Typical structural barriers include laws, charters, or Supreme Court cases that oppose or preclude the affirmative's plan. Norton notes that structural inherency requires remedying permanent flaws rather than changing the magnitude of current measures.¹⁰ Calls for increased/decreased funding, enforcement, labor, etc. in the same general direction that the status quo is moving are not inherent under the stock issues paradigm.¹¹

Attitudinal inherency is the existence of values or beliefs that prevent the status quo from implementing the affirmative's plan.¹² For instance, a popular attitudinal barrier argument is that Congress is fundamentally opposed to the affirmative's plan (e.g., Congress has always voted down bills to eliminate Medicare). Without the affirmative fiat power, the existing attitudes preclude ameliorating the societal faults and the affirmative plan.

Whether inherency is presented as structural or attitudinal, it plays an important role, for inherency determines the opportunity cost of a particular position.¹³ Some argue that the burden of demonstrating inherency to such a rigorous extent has no place in the so-called real world. Advocates of this position argue that in society, inherency works only to prevent duplicate, and therefore

unnecessary actions. As a result, inherency should be de-emphasized in academic debate to parallel its role in society.¹⁴ This position denies one key reality. In the real world, policymakers understand that resources are limited and every action carries an opportunity cost, usually in the form of another action(s) that cannot be taken with those same resources. In theory, a reason why negative debaters present disadvantages to the affirmative plan is linked to opportunity cost: What must we "give up" to adopt the affirmative, and would those harms outweigh the benefits of resolutive adoption? In a world of shrinking resources and increasing demands, these decisions are real and good inherency arguments should train debaters to deal with these key issues.

Over the years, advocates have advanced a third form of inherency, which is called existential inherency. Existential inherency argues that the status quo is flawed in some significant way. At the same time, the advocate of change is unable, and even finds it unnecessary, to establish clearly the root cause of the problem. The affirmative asserts that because the problem exists, it must therefore be an inherent part of the status quo. Philosopher Bertrand Russell's analysis of the term "existential" aids understanding of this concept. He explains that the term "exists" logically means that there are objects in the world to which a given description applies; consequently, the act of defining something and demonstrating its presence is enough to prove its existence.¹⁵ The affirmative debater utilizing this philosophy argues that because a problem exists, a barrier to solving the problem must also exist, although he or she cannot precisely identify the barrier. The affirmative thus begs the question by arguing that because a problem exists, an attitudinal or structural barrier must exist, even though the affirmative is unable to identify either. Proponents of existential inherency argue that this inability to locate the dysfunction in the status quo should not prevent an attempt to alleviate the ills identified by the affirmative.¹⁶

The failure of existential inherency to identify this causality bypasses a critical evaluation of the cost-benefit analysis demanded in the adoption of any policy change. The continued existence of the problem demonstrates some obstacle to change. The mere existence of this barrier reveals some reason, logical or illogical, that is

preventing the affirmative's plan from being implemented. Without understanding these reasons, the negative cannot fully examine the potential harm the affirmative's plan might accrue.

The failure to identify the causality also presents a second problem of workability or solvency. Without establishing why change will not occur in the status quo, the affirmative cannot prove that its plan will bypass or overcome the unidentified inherent barrier(s) to change. For instance, if an affirmative argued anytime between the era of the Supreme Court cases of *Plessey vs. Ferguson* and *Brown vs. Board of Education* for legislative protection for African Americans, he or she could have presented a compelling case for change. However, a failure to identify that the Supreme Court had ruled "separate but equal" in *Plessey* would pose a noteworthy problem to the adoption of the affirmative plan, for any law that contrasted with the Supreme Court's holding would likely be struck down by the Court. Thus, an unidentified barrier might stand in the way of the implementation of the plan.

Indeed, the vast majority of scholars note that inherency is a stock issue and that this burden can be met only by demonstrating a structural or attitudinal barrier. Sheckels notes "Theorists generally agree that the status quo's failure to meet the goal must be inherent. Something-a law, a loophole, a Supreme Court decision-must be blocking the status quo from meeting the goal."¹⁷ The affirmative has the burden to demonstrate that the current system is structurally or attitudinally incapable of solving its problems. The inability to fulfill this burden within the stock issues paradigm fails to justify the resolution.¹⁸

To justify the debate resolution is the primary goal of affirmative debaters. In order to overcome the presumption against a change in policy, the affirmative, in discharging its burden of proof, must indict the status quo, find it lacking in some significant way, and propose a form of the resolution as an alternative action to solve the problem. Again, the focus of debate should be on the resolution, for the critic cannot make meaningful cost-benefit analysis of an affirmative proposal if he or she cannot determine whether adoption of the resolution is the key factor in producing a specific effect. If an affirmative fails to articulate causality for the problem or need then a critic cannot fully assess the impact of the resolution

on the problem. Moreover, resolutions that dictate a particular agent for action are further complicated by existential inherency arguments because without determining culpability of a current actor, the success or failure of the proposed agent of action cannot be adequately assessed.

Equally important, negative debaters who accept an affirmative's existential inherency position will find their argumentative ground severely limited. The negative can defend a status quo from resolitional change by offering a minor repairs or a counterplan that is designed to test the advantages of the resolution against non-resolitional alternatives. When the affirmative presents a structural or attitudinal inherency, the negative can fully defend the status quo by examining issues of opportunity cost, alternative causation, and other potential mechanisms that exist within the current system to solve the problem. However, once the negative agrees that the mere existence of a problem justifies change, its hands are tied. When presented with existential inherency, the negative can merely argue about the extent of the harm, the ability of the plan to solve the damage, or the topicality of the affirmative's proposal, for the negative's ability to assess accurately the impact of a particular resolution has been curtailed. By failing to identify the source of the *status quo's* failure, the affirmative slants the playing field in its favor, thus avoiding the issue of causality while violating the rules of engagement. Both infringements are pedagogically and theoretically significant. By circumventing the stock issues paradigm's reliance on identifying a clear connection between the harm and the resolitional agent, debaters deprive themselves of the benefits associated with argumentative theory and decision making. For similar reasons, authors argue that existential inherency it is not an acceptable form of inherency in the stock issues paradigm, for by its very definition, existential inherency circumvents the affirmative's burden to establish clearly an inherent barrier, which then shifts the responsibility to the negative.¹⁹

CONCLUSION

"Existential inherency exists because existential inherency exists" is a kind of circular reasoning that the NFA community of

debaters and judges should reject. As this paper has argued, the mere existence of a thing does not necessarily warrant change, especially when such an idea of inherency runs counter to decades of acceptance by theorists, coaches, and debaters in propositions of policy. With more and more individuals competing in L-D debate every year since L-D's codification within NFA, the need for theoretical discussions continues to increase. Attempting to outline some of the pedagogical benefits advanced by inherency's role within L-D, this paper offers a grounding point for future theoretical discussions and examinations of inherency. In its fifth year of national competition, Lincoln-Douglas debate continues to grow, offering students, coaches, and judges a different educational experience complete with a wide range of conventions that are theoretically and pedagogically rooted.

ENDNOTES

1. Dale Herbeck, *Paradigms of Debate*. (Kansas City: National Federation of State High School Association, 1988) 5-6.
2. Austin Freeley, *Argumentation and Debate: Critical Thinking for Reasoned Decision Making*. (California: Wadsworth, 1986); Herbeck, 6; Ziegelmüller & Dause.
3. John Schunk, "A Farewell to 'Structural Change': The Cure for Pseudo-Inherency," *Journal of the American Forensic Association* 14 (1978): 147; John Morello, "Defending the Present System's Capacity for Incremental Changes," *Journal of the American Forensic Association* 19 (1982): 115-121; Carl Flaningam, "Inherency and Incremental Change: A Response to Morello," *Journal of the American Forensic Association* 20 (1984): 321-6.
4. Arthur N. Kruger, *Modern Debate: Its Logic and Strategy*. (New York: McGraw Hill, 1960) 40-1; Ziegelmüller and Dause 20.

5. Herbeck 6.
6. William Harpine, "The Theoretical Base of Stock Issues," *The Forensic* 70 (1985): 6.
7. George Ziegelmüller & Charles Dause, *Argumentation: Inquiry and Advocacy*. (New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1974) 32-3.
8. Carolyn Keefe, Thomas B. Harte, and Laurence E. Norton, *Introduction to Debate*. (New York: Macmillan, 1982); Clark D. Kimball, and David McConkey, *Elements of Tournament Debate*. (Portland: J. Weston Walsh, 1974); Maridell Fryar, David A. Thomas, and Lynn Goodnight, *Basic Debate*, 2nd ed. (Lincolnwood: National Textbook Co., 1986); Michael Pfau, David A. Thomas, and Walter Ulrich, *Debate and Argument: A Systems Approach to Advocacy*. (Glenview: Scott Foresman, 1987); Gerald H. Sanders, *Introduction to Contemporary Academic Debate*, 2nd ed. (Prospect Heights: Waveland, 1983); Freeley; Enison *et al*; Kruger; Sheckels.
9. Freeley 168.
10. Norton 226-233.
11. Morello.
12. Freeley 168-9.
13. Thomas F. Mader, "The Inherent Need to Analyze Stasis," *Journal of the American Forensic Association* 4(1967): 13-20.
14. Freeley 169-170.
15. Bertrand Russell, *History of Western Philosophy* (London: George Allen & Unwin, Ltd., 1946 and New York: Simon and Shuster), pp. 859-60.
16. Freeley 169-170.

17. Sheckels 70.

18. Fryar *et al.* 54. See also Herbeck 6; Keefe *et al.* 233; Kimball *et al.*; Kruger, 45-7; Pfau, *et al.* 156.

19. Freeley 169-170; Sanders; Ziegelmueller *et al.* 34.

Women in Intercollegiate Forensics: Experiencing Otherness

Robert W. Greenstreet

Robert Greenstreet (EdD, Oklahoma State U, 1996) is assistant professor, Communication Department, East Central University, Ada, OK 74820-6899.

That women's experiences in intercollegiate forensics differ from the experiences of their male contemporaries comes as no surprise to the thousands of women who have participated, nor is it entirely unexpected in an activity which traces its historical origins to a time when women were barred from higher education (Greenstreet, 1989). That such inequity continues to exist nearly a century after the advent of intercollegiate forensics activities (debate and individual events competition) is more difficult to accept (Norton, 1982; Rieke & Sillars, 1975). Despite calls to encourage forensic participation by members of traditionally underrepresented groups, the intercollegiate forensic community has not reached out to women (McBath, 1975; Parson, 1984; Ziegelmueller, 1984; Bartanen, 1993; Duke, 1994). One reason significant improvement has not occurred may be that research into gender differences in forensics has not been directed toward any particular goal.

Recent research provides such direction in the form of a taxonomy of women's gender-based experiences in intercollegiate forensics (Greenstreet, Joeckel, Martin, & Piercy, 1996). This taxonomy affords forensic researchers a systematic approach to the phenomenon of gender inequity. When the forensics community understands which experiences women perceive to be gender-based, it will be able to recognize and address those experiences. This paper presents and explains the taxonomy, discusses the results of other forensic research where possible, and suggests a method for exploring the experiences of traditionally underrepresented groups.

THE CRITICAL INCIDENT TECHNIQUE

Before considering the taxonomy itself, it is helpful to

understand how it was developed. Greenstreet, Joeckel, Martin, and Piercy (1996) invited 280 female members of professional forensic associations to complete reports of their experiences using the Critical Incident Technique, a method used in thousands of studies in both education and industry for a variety of purposes. The purpose of this study was to develop a descriptive taxonomy that could serve as a basis for future research. The Critical Incident Technique asks subjects to provide brief descriptions about specific events they find significant to their experience (Flanagan, 1954; Downs, 1988). Flanagan (1954) writes "critical incidents obtained from interviews can be relied on to provide a relatively accurate account "of the subjects experiences" (p. 331). Completed incident reports were reviewed by all four researchers (Greenstreet, Joeckel, Martin, and Piercy) working independently. They independently distilled the subjects' statements, then clustered them within broad categories (positive or negative) according to the subjects' classifications. If a subject felt an incident to be positive, readers had no choice but to accept that subject's judgment in regard to its classification.

Since all data in a Critical Incident study are provided by subjects in narrative form, the method encourages those conducting the study to adopt the framework of the subjects, reducing the likelihood of research yielding a self-fulfilling prophesy. Variations on the Critical Incident Technique have been used in recent studies in the discipline of communication. The *Journal of Applied Communication Research* (Wood, 1992) recently published a "SPECIAL SECTION-TELLING OUR STORIES": SEXUAL HARASSMENT IN THE COMMUNICATION DISCIPLINE" [capitals in original] to focus attention on an issue critical to communication scholars. The narratives provided by respondents in the study represent critical incidents focused on sexual harassment. Foss and Foss (1994) indicate the use of personal experience in feminist scholarship empowers women by validating their experiences and helping them make sense of their world: "The exploration and use of personal experience as data is a significant

and subversive act in the process of constructing new methods and theories that truly take women's perspectives into account" (Foss & Foss, 1994, p. 42). Eichler and Lapointe (1985) indicate that since women have been largely overlooked in past research, it may be necessary immediately to focus studies on women in order to establish a base for future research that includes both genders.

The taxonomy developed by Greenstreet, Joeckel, Martin, and Piercy (1996) through this method includes matrixes of both positive and negative experiences. As yet, these matrixes have not been confirmed by further study. Limitations indicated in their report include an anticipated low return rate typical of Critical Incident studies and the sample bias in favor of forensic activity— subjects' names appeared on rosters of professional forensic associations (Greenstreet, Joeckel, Martin, and Piercy, 1996).

THE TAXONOMY

Relying on the subjects' initial classifications, Greenstreet, Joeckel, Martin, & Piercy (1996) clustered women's gender-based forensics experiences in the following taxonomy.

Table 1
Taxonomy of Women's Gender-Based Experiences
in Intercollegiate Forensics

Positive Experiences

- I. Expressions of Gratitude or Recognition
 - A. From Males
 - B. From Females
- II. Mentoring
 - A. By Males
 - B. By Females
- III. Access through Quotas
- IV. Consciousness-Raising
- V. Nurturing/Personal Concern

Negative Experiences

- I. Sexual Harassment
 - A. Sexual Propositions
 - B. Verbal Abuse
 - C. Remarks about Body or Appearance
- II. Sexism
 - A. Traditional Roles
 - B. Feminine is less than Masculine
- III. Discrimination in Employment
- IV. Lack of Support/Failure to Recognize Problem
 - A. By Colleagues
 - B. By Coach
- V. Aggression/Conflict
 - A. Female-Female
 - B. Female-Male
- VI. Overemphasis on Competition

The Positive Matrix

The positive matrix includes five distinct experiences, two of which were further divided for clarification.

I. Expressions of Gratitude or Recognition include such things as former students thanking coaches for encouraging them in forensics, contestants and coaches from other programs recognizing professional contributions, and remarks reinforcing professional status or personal achievement. One subject reports a graduating senior male thanking her for encouraging his participation in forensics; another subject is recognized as a trailblazer for her contemporaries. Typically these memorable moments occur during pivotal events or times of significant achievement for those expressing gratitude or recognition to the subjects. This area is separate from area V., Nurturing/Personal Concern, because it deals with work-related items.

II. Mentoring involves encouragement toward professional development as well as help along the way. Subjects reported being

mentored by both male and female undergraduate and graduate faculty. One subject credits her success at a national championship tournament to the tutelage of her "feminist" male coach. Another recalls a female program director encouraging her to enter the field. Important aspects of the mentoring relationship include professional development as well as re-visioning the subject's personal orientation.

III. Access through Quotas includes three instances where subjects felt their gender identification opened doors to professional advancement or enhanced status. One subject reports that being nominated for a national office was a positive experience because the organization became more gender-sensitive as a result of her candidacy. Another reports being invited to judge the final round of debate at a national championship tournament:

When I asked why me? [sic] the caller responded that they needed a representative from my district and he was looking for female judges to be represented.... I was flattered although I wondered if I would have been considered if I was [sic] a male.

Even when not fully accepted, subjects report increased access as a positive experience. One subject reports being named to the administrative committee for a tournament that serves to qualify students to participate in the national championships. Although she indicates "the males rarely spoke to me about anything pertaining to the tournament" and "I ended up doing go-for type things," she nevertheless classifies the incident as positive.

IV. Consciousness-Raising deals with learning experiences gained through participation in the activity. One subject reports using an impromptu speaking topic to "crystallize" her thinking concerning "the women's movement."

Other incidents involve professional activity around forensic events. One subject reports a women's debate forum helped her realize she was not the only one perceiving different treatment due to gender. Another reports a confrontative job interview in which

A male department chair "informed me that he had never hired a female teaching assistant in forensics and asked why he should amend that policy for me." The job was offered to me. I took great pleasure in declining that position.

Although this latter subject reports difficulty rating the incident as positive, she also indicates its value was that she learned from it.

V. Nurturing includes experiences of a personal nature, such as caring for someone who is ill, substituting for a parent, or personal encouragement unrelated to the job. Subjects reported nurturing as well as being nurtured by males and females. One subject recalls a tournament director finding her a place to rest and suggesting methods to relieve her discomfort as she suffered from the flu. Sometimes subjects themselves provided the nurturing. One subject reports "I served as a female role model for 'a student' and had fostered her growth as a person [emphasis in original]."

The Negative Matrix

Greenstreet, Joeckel, Martin, & Piercy (1996) developed a six category taxonomy of negative gender-based experiences from reports submitted by their subjects. They subdivided four of the major categories in the hope that such division would provide potentially significant distinctions for future researchers.

I. Sexual Harassment includes: sexual propositions, verbal abuse, and remarks about body or appearance, all of which are discussed below. Women who participate in intercollegiate forensics risk sexual harassment (Stepp, Simerly, and Logue, 1993; CEDA, 1993). All incidents in the research report males harassing females. Although subjects were not asked to indicate the strength of their response to the incidents, these reports often included very directly worded statements attesting to subjects' feelings.

A. Sexual Propositions

Szwapa (1992) reports that "almost forty percent [of survey

respondents] reported being the victims of forcible sexual advances at debate tournaments or at home while preparing for debate tournaments" (p. 11). The frequency and nature of reported sexual harassment should come as no surprise to those familiar with research in the area. Certainly the discipline of communication is not immune to such practices (Wood, 1992). Dziech and Weiner (1984) provide further proof of the ubiquitous and insidious nature of sexual harassment in higher education. Their study contends as many as 30% of women involved in higher education may expect to be sexually harassed during their stays in the academy.

One subject writes "The clearest memory I have regarding being a woman occurred while attending a coaches' reception and being harassed." Another, reporting incidents of continuing propositioning, writes that "memories of the actual conversations are vague, but not the effects they had on me. Even years later looking back I would describe it as a chilling effect." She further reports feeling her team's results would be in jeopardy if she responded too negatively, and adds that "My discomfort with male-female relations on the circuit was a contributing factor in my decision to disengage from...coaching." Another reports being propositioned by a coach for a period of over five years, beginning during her junior year of college.

B. Verbal Abuse

Reports of verbal abuse were difficult to misinterpret. One subject reports after she, as a judge, asked a debater to clarify his use of evidence he "flew into a rage yelling at his partner, the other team, and myself. We were 'bitches,' and 'fucking idiots.'" Another, attempting to encourage debaters who had finished to vacate the room so an already overdue round could begin, reports that "One of them turned on me and yelled 'who the fuck do you think you are, bitch?' " [emphasis in original]. Subjects also report being disappointed when this sort of behavior is reported to these students' program directors and no action is taken.

C. Remarks about Body or Appearance

Uninvited and inappropriate remarks about the subject's body

or physical appearance generally came out of the blue. Two incidents stem from written comments on judges' ballots referring to the contestants' looks or bodies rather than to their performances. One subject writes: "I found this extremely offensive and inappropriate. I was angry at this male judge [plus] disappointed in my male coach who did nothing about it." A third incident reports a short-lived male mutiny when, as new program director, the female coach banned puerile male behavior from squad functions.

II. Sexism is divided into two subcategories: traditional roles, and feminine is less than masculine.

A. Traditional Roles

In Greenstreet, Joeckel, Martin, and Piercy's (1996) report, sexism is often reported as stereotyping the subject into traditional roles, sometimes by the person the subjects expected to mentor them into the field. One subject reports being told to go home and cook dinner for her husband rather than attend a night class in forensic program management. The instructor, "the head debate coach and my boss," told her, "debate is a man's world" that she should leave. At the time, she was a year away from her Ph.D. Other subjects report male acquaintances assuming the subjects' reduced level of involvement resulted from decisions to bear children rather than seek advancement in their careers.

B. Feminine is Less than Masculine

Friedley and Manchester (1985) found males were much more likely to receive superior ranks and ratings at national championship individual events tournaments. In a subsequent study, Friedley and Manchester (1987) found contest judges in individual events generally treat males more favorably than females. J. Murphy (1989) tried to explain such differences by arguing that women engage in less competitive "women's speech" patterns. While documenting the debate community's "unconscionable" affirmative action record, Logue (1993, p. 8) contended women are unsuited to the competitive world of debate (and better suited to collaborative activities.) Of course, numerous researchers (Wright and Hosman, 1983; Crosby and Nyquist, 1977; Martin and Craig, 1983; Kennedy

and Camden, 1983; Dindia, 1987; Infante, Trebing, Shepherd, and Seeds, 1984; Bradley, 1987; and McMillan, Clifton, McGrath, and Gale, 1977) refute the claims that women are less rational, less expressive, less assertive, or less argumentative than men.

These reports relate expressions that "feminine" attitudes, abilities, or events are less significant than their "masculine" counterparts. One subject writes about being assigned "soft" (i.e., oral interpretation) events rather than debate or public address events. She also reports her male students' success in those events was attributed to factors other than their preparation and presentation (e.g., the events were perceived as less challenging than other events). Another subject reports increased success in her events as a result of adopting a more masculine look. A third subject reports seeking election to national office and having her candidacy belittled by a colleague who felt she would be foolish to oppose a man whom she had taught for several years.

III. Discrimination in Employment deals with hiring, promotion, treatment on the job, and assignment of job responsibilities. All reports detail discrimination by men. One subject reports a college president telling her the school was going to hire the male finalist for a position because driving to tournaments in severe winter weather was too dangerous for a woman. She was also asked if she would join the women's aid group, composed of faculty wives, to do work for the church sponsoring the school. A second subject reports being promised a high school position that was given to a man. Another subject reports that during tournament trips, she was roomed with undergraduate contestants while male graduate assistants were not.

IV. Lack of Support/Failure to Recognize Problem includes dismissal or trivialization of grievances by colleagues as well as failure by higher-ups to seek redress for grievances. A former Executive Secretary of the Cross Examination Debate Association (CEDA) writes: "There is no evidence that we are successfully reaching out to diverse groups. Relying on our pool of 'ex-debaters' to judge all of our rounds, retrenches the very patriarchal attitudes

we seek to change [sic]" (Bartanen, 1993, pp. 2-3). Logue (1993) claims that intercollegiate debate marginalizes women, as well as minorities, through a structure that assures white male dominance. One subject reported reducing her involvement in forensics and increasing her participation in student congress-type activities: "There seems to be less awkwardness in the presence of women and more respect for everyone's contribution in this activity."

Forensic research sometimes ignores the presence of women. Tomlinson (1986) failed to consider gender-oriented issues (e.g., participation rates, bias, harassment) in an examination of issues confronting CEDA. When Littlefield and Sellnow (1992) studied stress at the AFA-NIET, they did not isolate gender as a variable. Porter and Sommers' (1991) review of "Legal Issues Confronting the Director of Forensics" mentioned no gender-specific legal issues. Gill (1990); Sellnow and Ziegelmüller (1988); and McMillan and Todd-Mancillas (1991) gathered sufficient demographic data in their research projects to differentiate gender differences. None appears to have sought such distinctions, even when gender demographics are reported in their results.

V. Aggression/Conflict includes inappropriate responses to conflict by the subjects, usurpation of the subject's authority, and in one instance prohibition by a female judge of an argument from male debaters because the argument was overly-masculine. None of the reported incidents involves male-female conflict, perhaps because such conflicts are subsumed into more specific categories. One subject writes of disappointment in her own conduct, as she failed to confront an unprofessional judge. A former debater reports a "cat fight" with two female opponents during a debate. A third reports a female coach attempting to assume control of the subject's results tabulation room.

VI. Overemphasis on Competition indicates the perception that one subject's female colleagues place forensic activity too centrally in their lives. This subject felt her colleagues should discuss something other than the activity during their breaks from it.

DISCUSSION

The taxonomy of women's gender-based experiences in intercollegiate forensics suggests women value those experiences that include them—or allow them to include others—in the activity. The taxonomy also suggests experiences that exclude women and reinforce their identity as "other" are likely to discourage their participation. The negative matrix of the taxonomy suggests a patriarchic social system that works to deter threats to white male hegemony. Although this latter conclusion is not entirely supported, available evidence appears to point rather strongly in that direction.

Positive Experiences Include

The positive matrix includes many items male and female teachers find rewarding about their profession, such as expressions of gratitude or recognition, mentoring, consciousness-raising, and nurturing or personal concern. Several items appear to support stereotypes of traditional gender roles for women as nurturers and care-givers, but (as in previously-cited challenges to "Feminine is less than Masculine") other explanations appear equally likely.

The positive matrix appears to support Gilligan's (1982) argument that women mature toward a different moral ethic from men. Gilligan argues women mature toward an ethic of caring and affiliation rather than toward individuation. The women studied by Greenstreet, Joeckel, Martin, and Piercy (1996) appreciate experiences that draw them toward other people in a mutually caring manner. Such experiences include them—and allow them to include others—in the intercollegiate forensic community, reveal the concern of that community for them as individuals, and reinforce their sense of agency by recognizing their unique place in that community.

Only one item stands out as clearly a concern of a traditionally underrepresented group: access through quotas. Accepting the subject's apparent perspective, this item may also be viewed as inclusive. After all, as a result of the demand for

diversity, the subjects were able to participate on a more elite level in forensic activities. They also reported their participation helped open access for other women by making the intercollegiate forensic community more sensitive to issues of inclusion, at least insofar as gender is concerned.

Negative Experiences Exclude

The negative matrix further supports Gilligan's (1982) view, especially as several items correspond to behaviors that segregate or indicate either neutrality or outright hostility. Women in the field report being confronted with sexual harassment, sexism, employment discrimination, a lack of collegial support or even collegial awareness that these events constitute a problem, and gender-based aggression from other females—all of which are behaviors that exclude them and label them as "different."

Harassment makes the victim feel isolated and vulnerable. In one report, the victim also felt her students' success was at risk. The combination of feeling personally excluded from the comfort and security that males appear to share, and, at the same time, exposing students one is charged with nurturing to predatory behavior, is not an attractive prospect. As if the prospect of harassment alone were not enough to deter women from participating in the activity, those who would normally be expected to provide a support system, teammates, coaches, and colleagues, are likely to disregard such incidents, thus denying the significance of both the behavior and the victim. Such behavior denies the victim's agency and excludes her from the community's care. She becomes special, different, and outside the norm. If Gilligan (1982) is correct, this exclusionary treatment should be particularly uncomfortable for women, who at the highest level of maturity seek to connect and to include.

Forensics as Patriarchy

The picture provided by the negative matrix describes a field

unprepared or unwilling to accept women as participants. Women are sexually propositioned, verbally abused, and subject to inappropriate random remarks concerning their bodies or appearance. They sometimes perceive that their responses to such behavior will determine their students' future success. They are discouraged from entering nontraditional fields or assuming nontraditional roles, such as arguing assertively or cross-examining aggressively. They are consistently told to stay within their traditional stereotyped female roles, and are reminded that such roles are necessarily less significant than the masculine roles within the activity. They are subject to special gender barriers in gaining employment, and are treated as "different," read "inferior," once employed. When they bring these problems to those who should help resolve them, they are met with indifference or are discouraged from raising legitimate concerns. They are attacked by those with whom they wish to cooperate, as if every aspect of the intercollegiate forensic community were some sort of competition where one party has to win and the other must lose. Haslett, Geis, and Carter (1992) describe such behaviors as consistent with a social system used to exclude women or devalue their work. Lewis and Simon (1986) report similar experiences in higher education classrooms. If intercollegiate forensics provides such a system, and for many respondents it clearly does, lack of participation by women should be easy to understand.

Future Research

Although the taxonomy appears to describe a patriarchy determined to retain its hegemony, this data alone cannot justify such a description of the field. The matrixes described above are based on very few responses from a small percentage of the possible sample. Additionally, Greenstreet, Joeckel, Martin, and Piercy (1996) did not ask subjects to rate the experiences in terms of their affect loading, nor did they provide any indication of either the frequency with which these events occur or the arenas in which they might be

found. Indeed, such data was outside the scope of their project. However, their subject selection process, inviting participation from subjects identified on the rosters of forensic organizations, necessarily biased the results in such a fashion that they are likely *more positive* than one might expect. Still, future research is necessary to confirm and refine this taxonomy of gender-based experiences.

Once the taxonomy is established, researchers may begin to tackle tougher questions, such as how these factors relate to women's decisions to remain in the field or leave it, the frequency with which women experience these phenomena, and the commitment of the intercollegiate forensic community to resolving issues raised by its formally announced desire to include traditionally underrepresented groups in the activity. Certainly, CEDA (1993) has already taken formal steps to discourage many of the most odious of the behaviors reflected in the negative matrix. The taxonomy developed by Greenstreet, Joeckel, Martin, and Piercy (1996) enables researchers to draft surveys to be circulated at tournaments, among program alumnae, or as exit surveys for those who choose to discontinue participation.

CONCLUSION

The purpose of this paper is to share the recently-developed taxonomy of women's gender-based experiences in forensics in the hope that the taxonomy will enable the forensic community to understand those experiences. Such an understanding should enable those involved in that community to begin movement toward the goals espoused in Sedalia and Evanston and find ways to encourage participation in forensics from a group that has traditionally been underrepresented—women.

The taxonomy provides a starting point from which research may move forward. These matrixes also inform forensic practitioners of experiences their students and colleagues may encounter as part of their forensic education. It is not difficult to understand why a

person who experienced what the negative matrix reports would be unlikely to continue participating in the activity that enabled those experiences. Clearly, valid reasons exist to explain why women may continue to be underrepresented in the intercollegiate forensic community, especially in debate. But just as clearly, the positive matrix offers experiences that have continued to attract women, and men, to the activity.

The method used to develop the taxonomy also offers promise for researching the experiences of other traditionally underrepresented groups. By encouraging researchers to adopt the perspective of their subjects and by encouraging the subjects to share their perceptions in their own words, the Critical Incident Technique affords researchers the opportunity to glimpse the world through the eyes of the research subject. The resultant world view offers the intercollegiate forensic community its best opportunity to understand and respond to that view.

From the base of information revealed in this paper, educators may begin to devise coping strategies to help their students and colleagues deal with the negative experiences. Educators may also find ways to emphasize and broaden the positive experiences that draw women to the activity. Such planning might be expected to enhance efforts to recruit and retain women in the activity. At a minimum, this taxonomy may also help forensic educators become more sensitive to the real pain the negative matrix behaviors cause their students, their professional colleagues, and their friends.

REFERENCES

- Bartanen, M. C. (1993, May). The future of CEDA: A pessimistic assessment. *CEDA Report*, 1-3.
- Bradley, P. H. (1980). Sex, competence, and opinion deviation: An expectancy states approach. *Communication Monographs*, 47, 101-110.

- Bradley, P. H. (1987). Gender differences in persuasive communication and attribution of success and failure. *Human Communication Research, 13*, 372-385.
- CEDA, (1993). *Statement on discrimination and sexual harassment*. Adopted at the national meeting of the Cross Examination Debate Association, concurrent with the meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Miami Beach, FL.
- Cline, R. J. (1986). The effects of biological sex and psychological gender on reported and behavioral intimacy and control of self-disclosure. *Communication Quarterly, 34*, 41-54.
- Crosby, F. & Nyquist, L. (1977). The female register: An empirical study of Lakoff's hypotheses. *Language and Society, 6*, 313-322.
- Crenshaw, A. C. (1990, November). Dodging the oppositional dynamic: A feminist perspective on debate practice. Paper presented at the meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Chicago, IL.
- Dindia, K. (1987). The effects of sex of subject and sex of partner on interruptions. *Human Communication Research, 13*, 345-371.
- Downs, C. W. (1988). *Communication audits*. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.
- Duke, D. (1994, October). Letter to CEDA membership.
- Dziech, B. W. & Weiner, L. (1984). *The lecherous professor: Sexual harassment on campus*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Eichler, M. & Lapointe, J. (1985). *On the treatment of the sexes in research*. Ottawa: Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.
- Flanagan, J. C. (1954). The critical incident technique. *Psychological Bulletin, 51*, 327-358.
- Foss, K. A. & Foss, S. K. (1983). The status of research on women and communication. *Communication Quarterly, 31*, 195-204.
- Foss, K. A. & Foss, S. K. (1994). Personal experience as evidence in feminist scholarship. *Western Journal of Communication, 58*, 39-43.

- Friedley, S. A. & Manchester, B. B. (1985, November). Male/female levels of participation in regional and national individual events tournaments. Paper presented at the meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Denver, CO.
- Friedley, S. A. & Manchester, B. B. (1987). An examination of male/female judging decisions in individual events. *National Forensic Journal*, 6, 11-20.
- Gill, M. (1990). Why forensics coaches quit: A replication and extension. *National Forensic Journal*, 8, 179-188.
- Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Greenstreet, R. W. (1989). Student interest and higher education: Lessons from the literary societies. *Journal of the Oklahoma Speech Theater Communication Association*, 11, 17-30.
- Greenstreet, R. W., Joeckel, M. K., Martin, J. S., and Piercy, K. R. (1996). The gender based experiences of women in intercollegiate forensics. Unpublished manuscript.
- Haslett, B., Geis, F. L., & Carter, M. R. (1992). *The organizational woman: Power and paradox*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation.
- Infante, D. A., Trebing, J. D., Shepherd, P. E., & Seeds, D. E. (1984). The relationship of argumentativeness to verbal aggression. *The Southern Speech Communication Journal*, 50, 67-77.
- Kennedy, C. W. & Camden, C. T. (1983). A new look at interruptions. *The Western Journal of Speech Communication*, 47, 45-58.
- Lewis, M. & Simon, R. I. (1986). A discourse not intended for her: Learning and teaching within patriarchy. *Harvard Educational Review*, 56, 457-472.

- Littlefield, R. S. & Sellnow, T. L. (1992). Assessing competition and stress: The perceived effect of tournament atmosphere on students and coaches. *National Forensic Journal*, 10, 1-10.
- Logue, B. J. (1985, May). An examination of gender-based levels of participation in CEDA debate. Paper presented at the meeting of the Eastern Communication Association.
- Logue, B. J. (1993, November). The debate activity: Void of a feminist perspective. Paper presented at the meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Miami Beach, FL.
- McBath, J. H. (1975). *Forensics as communication: The argumentative perspective*. Skokie, IL: National Textbook.
- McMillan, J. K. & Todd-Mancillas, W. R. (1991). An assessment of the value of individual events in forensics competition from the students' perspectives. *National Forensic Journal*, 9, 1-17.
- McMillan, J. R., Clifton, A. K., McGrath, D., & Gale, W. S. (1977). Women's language: Uncertainty or interpersonal sensitivity and emotionality? *Sex Roles*, 3, 545-559.
- Martin, J. N. & Craig, R. T. (1983). Selected linguistic sex differences during initial social interactions of same-sex and mixed-sex dyads. *The Western Journal of Speech Communication*. 47, 16-28.
- Medcalf, L. D. (1984, November). The participation and success of women in CEDA debate. Paper presented at the meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Chicago, IL.
- Murphy, J. M. (1989). Separate and unequal: Women in the public address events. *National Forensic Journal*, 7, 115-125.
- Norton, L. E. (1982). History of debate. In C. Keefe, T. B. Harte, & L. E. Norton, *Introduction to debate* (pp. 1-23). New York: Macmillan.
- Parson, D. (ed.) (1984). *American forensics in perspective*. Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association.

- Porter, S. B. & Sommerness, M. D. (1991). Legal issues confronting the director of forensics. *National Forensic Journal*, 9, 109-123.
- Rieke, R. D. & Sillars, M. O. (1975). *Argumentation and the decision making process*. New York: Wiley.
- Siegler, D. M. & Siegler, R. S. (1976). Stereotypes of male's and female's speech. *Psychological Reports*. 39, 167-170.
- Sellnow, T. L. & Ziegelmuller, G. (1988). The persuasive speaking contest: An analysis of twenty years of change. *National Forensic Journal*, 6 75-88.
- Serafini, D. M. & Pearson, J. C. (1983-1984). Leadership behavior and sex role socialization: Two sides of the same coin. *The Southern Speech Communication Journal*, 396-405.
- Stepp, P., Simerly, G., & Logue, B. (1993, November). Sexual harassment in CEDA debate 1993. Paper presented at the meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Miami Beach, FL.
- Szwapa, C. A. (1992, October-November) Sexual harassment in debate: Fact or fiction? Paper presented at the meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Chicago, IL.
- Tavris, C. (1992). *The mismeasure of woman*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Tomlinson, J. E. (1986). Current issues in the Cross Examination Debate Association. *National Forensic Journal*, 4, 91-103.
- Wood, J. T. (ed.) (1992) "TELLING OUR STORIES": SEXUAL HARASSMENT IN THE COMMUNICATION DISCIPLINE. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 20, 349-418.
- Worthen, T. K. & Pack, G. N. (1993, November). The case of the missing female debater revisited: Judge and debater perceptions of team effectiveness based on gender. Paper presented at the meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Miami Beach, FL.

- Wright, J. W. II, & Hosman, L. A. (1983). Language style and sex bias in the courtroom: The effects of male and female use of hedges and intensifiers on impression formation. *The Southern Speech Communication Journal*, 137-152.
- Ziegelmüller, G. (1984). An agenda for forensics. In Parson, D. (ed.) (1984). *American forensics in perspective* (pp. 1-4). Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association.

Professional Resources

Graduate Education in Argumentation and Forensics: A Note on the 1996 SCA Graduate Directory

Michael W. Shelton

Mr. Shelton is a doctoral candidate and teaching assistant in the Department of Communication, University of Kentucky, Lexington, KY 40506.

President Bill Clinton's 1997 State of the Union message seemed designed to help elevate higher education's place on the national agenda, but many within higher education are more specifically concerned with the status of graduate education. Within higher education, a host of surveys, reports, and meetings have pointed to concern regarding the nature of graduate education. Magner (1997) reported that the academic job market for new doctoral degree holders seemed to be on a slightly improving trend in English, mathematics, and a few other specific disciplines. Former American Council of Higher Education president Robert Atwell's (1996) assessment was much more pessimistic: "The current mismatch between doctoral education and the number and kinds of jobs available for new faculty members is at the root of many of the serious problems facing colleges and universities" (p. B4). Concerns regarding graduate education go deeper than interest regarding the academic job market. Peter Brooks (1996) of Yale University has been one of many, for example, to argue that the overall nature of graduate education should be redefined and refocused. And, it was recently reported that a large number of graduate programs in several states were facing potential budget cuts and even possible elimination (Schmidt, 1997).

The communication discipline has been no stranger to the discussions and debates regarding the status of graduate education. The Speech Communication Association (SCA) has long sponsored an interest group designed to represent graduate students, particularly in regard to annual convention concerns. The 1996 SCA

convention featured the first workshop designed to assist graduate students in getting their first jobs, and the convention's placement center has been an important "job search" option for graduate students and others for many years. In addition, SCA President Judith Trent (1997) recently announced the formation of a council charged with exploring the nature of doctoral granting programs in the communication discipline. The SCA has also renewed its efforts to provide general information regarding graduate programs in the discipline to many audiences with the publication of a new series of graduate program directories that started in 1994. Shelton (1997) has recently worked to extend the information associated with the 1994 directory by providing summaries, commutative data, discussion, and materials not contained within the directory itself.

A few attempts have been made to illuminate graduate education within the specialty area of argumentation and forensics. Several years ago, for example, Benoit and Follert (1986) offered an extensive examination of argumentation theory courses at the graduate level within the broader communication discipline. More recently, Shelton's (1996) assessment of the job market in forensics, over the past several years, pointed to opportunities for both masters degree and doctoral degree graduates. Unfortunately, little other specific attention is devoted to the status of graduate education in argumentation and forensics. It might be interesting to know, for example, how many graduate programs within the broader communication discipline offer a concentration within the area, how these programs vary from state to state, important admissions requirements associated with the programs, and other descriptive information regarding graduate education in argumentation and forensics. Such information would offer potential benefits to both students and educators who might wish to have quick and ready reference to such material in order to review options, compare programs, and generally illuminate graduate options within the area. The present effort is an attempt to generate the information that might facilitate the attainment of these benefits.

METHOD

The 1996 *Graduate Directory* published by SCA and edited by Michelle Randall serves as the data base for the present project. The 1996 directory was only the second document expressly devoted to graduate education to be published by SCA since 1985. All institutional mentors of SCA were contacted and requested to respond to a survey designed to provide information for the directory. A total of 284 graduate programs responded and the results, along with addresses for another 15 programs, are reported in the directory. The directory lists programs associated with 32 different areas of concentration. The present project deals only with that data reported for programs within the argumentation and forensics area of concentration. The directory provides alphabetical and state-by-state listings of both masters and doctoral degree granting programs. The directory also provides a host of specific data for each program reporting information. Those programs that offer a concentration within argumentation and forensics are examined for state location, number of graduate faculty, number of masters and doctoral students (both full-time and part-time in each case), admissions requirements, tuition and fee waiver options for those receiving fellowships and assistantships, total number of financial aid appointments, requirements concerning a masters thesis, and the range of financial aid appointments.

RESULTS

A total of 34 masters degree programs in 24 states reported that they offered a concentration in argumentation and forensics, with a mean (average) of 1.4 programs in each state. The largest number of programs (7) offering the specialty were in California. Three other states featured two programs each, while the remainder of the 30 states included reported only one program offering this particular area of concentration. A total of 9 programs in 9 states reported that they offered a concentration in argumentation and

forensics at the doctoral level, with a mean (average) that is obviously one. State-by-state data of both masters and doctoral degree programs offering the concentration in argumentation and forensics are reported in Table I.

All graduate programs offering a concentration in argumentation and forensics reported data regarding both the number of graduate faculty and the number of graduate students, both masters and doctoral level. A total of 466 full-time faculty members were reported to be associated with graduate programs in the concentration. Another 48 faculty were reported to be associated with the programs on a part-time basis, for a total number of faculty of 514. These data are summarized in Table 2. A total of 909 full-time masters students and 431 part-time masters students, with an overall total of 1,340, were reported to be associated with graduate programs offering a concentration in argumentation and forensics. At the doctoral were 445 full-time students level and another 124 part-time students, for a total of 569 students, in graduate programs offering the concentration. These data are summarized in Table 3.

A variety of admissions data were reported by graduate programs offering a concentration in argumentation and forensics. The most frequently mentioned admissions requirement was submission of scores from the Graduate Records Examination (GRE). Twenty-four of the 34 programs offering the concentration area required the GRE of prospective students. Some mix of data were also reported regarding requirements for a thesis or project at the masters degree level. Thirteen of the 34 masters programs required a thesis or project to be completed for graduation by students. Another 11 of the programs indicated that a thesis or project was optional, while 7 indicated that it varied with the specific nature of the individual student's program of study. Two programs did not report these data.

A good deal of data were reported from the various graduate programs regarding financial aid opportunities. Twenty-two programs indicated that fees and tuition would be waived for students who receive a fellowship or assistantship, 5 indicated that

it varied, and another 5 explicitly said that fees and tuition would not be waived. Among all of the programs offering a concentration in argumentation and forensics, 703 total financial aid appointments were made for teaching and research. None of the programs reported financial aid appointments specifically for work with forensics. A wide range was reported for the dollar amount of financial aid appointments. The overall range for appointments for students at the masters level varied from a low of 713 dollars per year, to a high of \$55,000. At the doctoral level, the low was \$6,000 and the high was \$45,000 for financial aid annual totals.

DISCUSSION

With a total of 34 programs offering a concentration in argumentation and forensics, that particular concentration falls in the middle range in relation to other areas of concentration for graduate study within the larger communication discipline. The largest concentration within the broader discipline was mass communication with 136 masters programs and 38 doctoral programs offering degrees in the area. The smallest concentration was communication and aging with a total of 9 programs offering graduate degrees in the area, 7 at the master's level, and 2 at the doctoral level. Such comparisons suggest that argumentation and forensics is not among the most popular specialties within the broader discipline, nor is it remarkable for being one of the smallest. This may be in part due to the fact that forensic programs have traditionally been housed within departments of communication (Stepp & Thompson, 1988).

State-by-state data regarding graduate programs offering a specialty area of concentration in argumentation and forensics are interesting in many ways. These data suggest that argumentation and forensic concentrations are relatively scarce in some ways. It should not be surprising that California features the largest number of masters degree programs with a concentration in the area, as it is clearly one of the most populous states. Population alone is not, however, a good guide to the availability of graduate programs with

concentrations in the area. Two very heavily populated states, New York and Florida, offer no programs with a concentration in argumentation and forensics. These data may indicate that forensic activities are very robust in California as most observers would note, and that a solid commitment to training in argumentation and forensics exists there. However, only 9 doctoral programs in the entire nation offer a concentration in the area. This suggests that graduate students have very limited options if they wish to extend their studies with a specialty in argumentation and forensics. It may also suggest that many who locate in the area may have specialized in another area of concentration during their doctoral training. In fact, Shelton (1996) reported that areas, such as interpersonal communication and persuasion, were among the subjects most often requested to be taught with positions in forensics.

Graduate faculty and student enrollment data are also illuminating in many ways. Both segments of data generally suggest that a good number of individuals are associated with instruction and study in argumentation and forensics, which may be a potential concern regarding the match between graduate program training and the job market for those with a specialty in the area. Shelton (1996), for example, reported that only 185 job searches for positions in forensics appeared in SCA's *Spectra* between 1990 and 1994. Although those data do not reflect everyone who is teaching argumentation or those involved in forensics at the high school level, it does suggest that the entire pool of graduates from programs offering a concentration in argumentation and forensics do not select a career in coaching or directing forensic activities. As Colbert and Biggers (1992) summarized, a number of individuals with training in the area tend to find themselves in law schools, in business, in other professional areas outside forensics, and in the broader communication discipline.

Other data reported in this project might be helpful in shedding light on the options available for undergraduates who are considering a concentration in argumentation and forensics during their graduate education training. These data suggest, for example,

that a wide range of financial aid appointment options are available. Once a potential graduate student identifies the pool of programs available in the area, it is easy to see from these summary data that most programs waive tuition and fees for students who hold a fellowship or assistantship, and that resources can vary from relatively scarce (\$713 per year) to relatively abundant (\$55,000 per year). The student who is considering a graduate education with a concentration in the area can also see that options vary regarding the need to complete a masters thesis or project. A student who is also working as an assistant with a forensic program might prefer, for example, a program that did not require the extra demand of writing a thesis. Those more concerned with developing refined scholarship skills related to argumentation theory and practice might, however, be more inclined to select the thesis option.

The present project could be extended in many ways. One might, for instance, survey all of those graduate programs offering a concentration in argumentation and forensics to discover the nature of specific coursework and other material that might be of interest to potential graduate students. It would also be possible to extend Benoit and Follert's (1986) research in a similar manner. These data also suffer from all of the limitations associated with the collective data of the 1996 directory. Many programs failed to report specific pieces of information requested. Random contacts with a number of communication graduate programs also suggests that some numerical data may have been either misreported or misrecorded during the editing process. These summary data from this brief research note do point to one very promising area for future effort. The National Forensic Association might take responsibility to produce a document, which emulates the SCA graduate directory, that is concerned only with the area of argumentation and forensics.

REFERENCES

- Atwell, R.H. (1996, November 29). Doctoral education must match the nation's needs and the realities of the marketplace. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. B4-B5.
- Benoit, W.L. & Follert, V.F. (1986). Graduate courses in argumentation theory. *Communication Education*. 35,61-66.
- Brooks, P. (1996, December 20). Graduate learning as apprenticeship. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. A52.
- Colbert, K. & Biggers, T. (1992). Why should we support debate? In D. Thomas & J. Hart (Eds.) *Advanced debate: Readings in theory, practice and teaching*. (2-7). Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Co.
- Magner, D.K. (1997, January 31). Job market for Ph.D.s shows first signs of improvement, but uncertainty remains. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. A8-A9.
- Randall, M. (Ed.) (1996). *Directory of graduate programs*. Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association.
- Schmidt, P. (1997, February 14). Sweeping reviews lead states to consider cutting many academic programs. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. A3 3.
- Shelton, M.W. (1997). Graduate study in the communication discipline: An extension of 1994 directory data. *Journal of the Association for Communication Administration*. January/No. 1, 69-75.
- Shelton, M.W. (1996). Another glance at the want ads: Forensic positions 1990 through 1994. *National Forensic Journal*. 14, 45-57.
- Stepp, P.L. & Thompson, R.B. (1988). A survey of forensics activity at selected colleges and universities in the United States. *National Forensic Journal*. 5,121-136.
- Trent, J.S. (1997, March). Doctoral education council to meet in retreat. *Spectra*. 2 + 1 1 .

TABLE 1: Graduate Program Concentrations in Argumentation and Forensics

State	M.A. Programs	Ph.D Programs
Alabama	1	
Arkansas	1	
California	7	1
Colorado	1	
Connecticut	1	
Georgia	1	1
Illinois	2	1
Indiana	2	1
Iowa	1	1
Kansas	2	1
Michigan	1	1
Minnesota	1	
Missouri	1	
Nebraska	1	1
Nevada	1	
North Carolina	1	
North Dakota	1	
Ohio	1	
Oregon	1	
Pennsylvania	1	
Texas	1	1
Utah	1	1
Washington	1	
Wyoming	1	

TABLE 2: Graduate Faculty

Full-time	466
Part-time	48
Total	514

TABLE 3: Graduate Students

Masters Students	
Full-time	909
Part-time	431
Doctoral Students	
Full-time	445
Part-time	124