

MOTIVATIONAL TENSION: WINNING VS PEDAGOGY IN ACADEMIC DEBATE

*Stephen C. Wood and Pamela A. Rowland-Morin**

In the inaugural issue of *The Quarterly Journal of Public Speech*, Frank H. Lane (1915) noted the paradoxical nature of academic debate as part of the discipline of speech communication. He confirmed the educational benefits of debate noting that "[it] is an exercise in ultimate analysis and intensive study of material and method" (Lane, p. 13). Second, he spoke of the inherent tension within debate: "One thing that complicate[s] the situation is the fact that we are working under two ideals: one to win, and the other to educate" (p. 14). This tension, expressed in speech journals as early as 1915, continues between the educational goals of debate and its competitive nature.

Haiman (1964) and Gow (1967) argued that winning was the prime motivational influence on debaters. Later, Ehrlich's (1972) position was that debaters are taught to be excessively win-oriented specifically at the expense of communication skills. However, empirical data were not available until Hill (1982) reported the reasons why students engage in competitive debate at the college level. He noted that while individuals speculated on reasons why students debate, "empirical research has not provided verifiable data on this issue" (Hill, p. 77). Hill specifically wanted to test the assertion made by some scholars that debate was a "win-at-all-cost" activity. Hill also felt that college administrators, debate coaches and debaters would find such information useful.

Colbert and Biggers (1985) presented three pedagogically sound reasons why speech communication scholars and educators should continue to support competitive academic debate: (1) debate improves communication skills, (2) debate provides a unique educational experience (i.e., depth of study, complex analysis and focused critical thinking) and, (3) debate offers excellent pre-professional training. In a review of thirteen studies, Colbert and Biggers concluded that "the educational benefits of debate seem to be well documented" (p. 237). When Colbert (1987) tested the rela-

**The National Forensic Journal*, VII (Fall, 1989), pp. 81-97.

STEPHEN C. WOOD is Associate Professor of Speech Communication and PAMELA A. ROWLAND-MORIN is Assistant Professor of Speech Communication at The University of Rhode Island, Kingston, RI 02881.

This research was supported in part by a research fellowship grant from The University of Rhode Island. The authors would like to acknowledge Mark Allsup and Owen Matthews for their assistance with the data compilation.

tionship between students participation in competitive debate and critical thinking skills he concluded that "Both CEDA and NDT trained debaters independently outscored the nondebaters on critical thinking tests. This finding was true for the pretest, for the posttest, and for the differences between pretest and posttest" (Colbert, p. 200).

Perhaps the fundamental issue is, does the competitive nature of debate augment or diminish the educational benefits for students? The review of literature by Colbert and Biggers (1985), Colbert (1987) and Hill (1982) suggests that the competitive aspect of debate does not diminish the educational soundness of activity. Others agree that extrinsic rewards do not necessarily have a negative impact on intrinsic interest in a task (Cormier, 1986). Thus, a student involved in debate may find the competition rewarding (extrinsic interest) but that does not diminish *de facto* the educational motivation (intrinsic interest).

The Hill (1982) study is particularly important because it surveys the attitudes of students who debate. As such, it represents a starting point for continued empirical research. That is, regardless of how debate coaches, colleagues in speech communication or administrators generalize about the competitive nature of debate, the responses from the debaters in the Hill study reveal how the participants perceive the activity.

Hill (1982) surveyed ninety debaters using a self-report, open-ended survey administered at three southeastern tournaments.¹ The single question asked of the subjects was: "List in order of importance as many reasons as you can that accurately describe your motivation for being involved in debate" (p. 80). Based on content analysis, Hill reported the emergence of six categories encompassing thirty-three responses. Three conclusions were drawn: First, "within any group of debaters numerous idiosyncratic motivational interpretations are likely to emerge. ... (Second) a common core of motivations [exist]... (Third) the category of Educational Needs emerges as the most important category . . . more important than Competitive Needs" (p. 86-87). These findings are important since they address the fundamental question of diminished pedagogical rationale due to the competitive nature of debate.

There are reasons, however, which prompt a replication of the Hill (1982) study. First, a replication allows for refinements in the methodology. The methodology employed by Hill, while appropriate for an initial study, was limited by geographical bias, the intuitive nature of the emergent categories, the use of rank ordering for

category determination, and the lack of demographic distinctions between novice and varsity debaters and NDT and CEDA debaters.

Second, continued periodic replication can track shifting perceptions on the fundamental nature of debate over time. The time factor may be especially important since there has been a major shift in the number of college programs that participate in NDT and CEDA debate since the early 1980s. (Assuming student attitudes do not shift as a function of time is an assumption that warrants periodic testing.) Further, examining whether novice debaters perceive the activity as more or less competitive or educational than varsity debaters can be controlled and reported.

Since competitive academic debate has been a fundamental part of speech communication and higher education (i.e., Protagoras, 400 B.C.), the activity warrants periodic examination. The increased participation in CEDA and the decreased participation in NDT in the 1980's should be particularly interesting to educators. Much has been written concerning the perceived differences between CEDA and NDT (See, Swanson, 1981; Loudin and Austin, 1983; Brownlee, 1985; Rowland, 1985; Lawson, 1986, p. 18-20; and Pelham and Watt, 1986, pp. 8-10). There are several distinctions that are not usually disputed: (1) CEDA generally debates nonpolicy resolutions and NDT debates policy resolutions; (2) CEDA debates a different resolution every semester and NDT debates the same resolution for the school year; and (3) CEDA has an open national tournament and NDT has a selective national tournament. Other distinctions are occasionally disputed: (1) CEDA promotes squad participation and NDT promotes team participation; (2) CEDA does not demand as intensive a use of evidence as does NDT; and (3) CEDA debaters are expected to speak at rates that reflect oratorical standards whereas NDT debaters are generally expected to speak at rates often doubling an oratorical standard. The locus of the controversy between CEDA and NDT centers on the pedagogical justification for each style of debate.

Central to debate's *raison d'etre* in departments of speech communication is the students' ability to develop oral communication, creative and critical thinking skills (invention, disposition, style, delivery and memory). The initial rationalization for founding CEDA (then known as the Southwest Cross Examination Debate Association—SCEDA) was to offer "an alternative to the pattern of rapid delivery, over-reliance on evidence, high pressure competition, and lack of humor that has come to characterize

American tournament debating" (Pelham and Watt, 1986, p. 8). While others have suggested that changing the structure of debate does not, in and of itself, lessen the problems inherent in debate. The tendency to speak fast in competitive debate rounds is an example: "there is no inherent delivery difference between propositions of judgment (CEDA resolutions) and propositions of policy (NDT resolutions). The well-researched debater will always have more material available than can realistically be presented within the time limits of debate" (Lawson, 1986, p. 18).

Our research makes no *a priori* comparative judgments concerning the educational value of either CEDA or NDT. Obviously, those who have remained with NDT have a vested interest in their activity as do the comparatively newer CEDA programs. Yet neither is self evidently better than the other, just different. The existence of two viable collegiate debate circuits is unique in the history of American debate. The impact they have had on the educational nature of debate needs to be studied. For example, do students in NDT perceive debate differently than students in CEDA? If so, are NDT debaters more concerned with winning and less concerned with the educational benefits of debate than CEDA debaters or vice versa?

Many of the speculations about the differences between NDT and CEDA can be confirmed, altered, or abandoned with a refined replication of the Hill (1982) study which would control for the NDT and CEDA variable. More importantly, the relative position of the activity to its pedagogical rationale may be evaluated. Further, controlling the time (especially during a period of rapid growth of CEDA and a decline in NDT participation) may reveal shifting motivational influences. Perhaps stability of motivational influences over time is not self-evident and warrants periodic testing.

Controlling for differences between novice and varsity debaters may reveal any shifting of perceptions linked to the number of years experience in the activity. Do students who have just begun their intercollegiate debate career view the educational goals/winning ratio differently than students with several years of debate experience? Intuitively, differences in their perceptions of debate could be expected. However, this question needs to be tested specifically.

Based on the larger concern of colleges, universities, and speech communication departments along with the possibilities revealed in the Hill (1982) study, a fundamental research question emerges:

Given the range of motivational influences, what are the most important reasons for student involvement in intercollegiate debate?

This research question generates four specific questions examined in this study:

Question 1—Do the core responses identified in the Hill (1982) study accurately measure motivational influences?

Question 2—Do the motivational influences differ or shift as a function of time?

Question 3—Will there be differences in motivational influences reported by novice and varsity debaters?

Question 4—Will there be differences in motivational influences reported by CEDA and NDT debaters?

The first question is primarily concerned with the soundness of the Hill (1982) study. Will a replication, with some modification of methodology, produce similar results? Replication, as a basic tenet of scientific research, can help confirm, modify, or reject earlier findings. The second, third, and fourth questions deal with factors not tested in the Hill study and provide new information concerning the motivational influence of debaters.

METHODOLOGY

A survey was prepared using thirty-two of the items identified in the Hill (1982) study. (One item, "Undetermined," was not included.) A five point Likert-type scale was used for each item. Demographic information such as level of experience,² involvement in CEDA and NDT, and region (by state) was collected. The survey was administered at four tournaments in 1983 (N=248) and at three tournaments in 1987 (N=139). Table 1 illustrates the breakdown of the sample in each of the two survey years. The

Table 1

Survey Sample Information

Year	Total	Novice/Varsity	CEDA / NDT	States in Survey Sites
1983	248	127 / 121	160 / 88	19: UT, RI, IL
1987	139	69 / 70	115 / 24	18: RI, NY, VA
Total	N=387	196 / 191	275 / 112	

surveys were distributed after the preliminary rounds and collected immediately upon completion. The surveys were administered prior to the elimination rounds being announced.

The mean scores, ranks, and rank order correlations for each item and category were calculated. This permitted comparisons to Hill's (1982) core responses and for a comparison between the 1983 and 1987 surveys, CEDA and NDT debaters, and novice and varsity debaters.

RESULTS

The first step in the analysis compares the rank ordering of items from the Hill (1982) study with the 1983 and 1987 surveys. Table 2 notes the rank order correlations (Spearman and Kendall correlation coefficients) for 1987 and 1982; 1987 and 1983; and 1983 and 1982. The rank order correlation coefficient between the two survey years of the study (1983 and 1987) is .97 (Spearman) and .89 (Kendall). The rank order correlation coefficient between the 1987 and 1982 surveys (Spearman .55, Kendall .39) and between the 1983 and 1982 surveys (Spearman .61, Kendall .43) are lower but still reveal a strong, positive correlation (see Table 2).

Table 2
Item Correlation Among Three Surveys
N=32

Survey Years			Rank Order Correlation	
X	Y	Z	Spearman (Rho) /Z	Kendall (Tau) /Z
1987	1983		.97 (Z=5.40)	.89 (Z=7.18)
1987		1982	.55 (Z=3.05)	.39 (Z=3.14)
	1983	1982	.61 (Z=3.42)	.43 (Z=3.48)

Since the mean ranks from 1982 are not comparable to the 1983 and 1987 data,³ Table 3 notes the rank and mean scores for the 1983 and 1987 surveys. The Hill ranking for each item is placed in the last column along with a notation of "C" if that item is one of Hill's "Core Responses." The "Factor of Displacement" is included for the Hill study and the 1983 survey. The Factor of Displacement (FD) is a descriptive statistic indicating the disparity of item ranking between the 1987 survey and the 1983 and 1982 surveys.

Table 3
Rank/Mean Scores/Factors of Displacement
For Motivational Items

ITEM	1987 Rank/ Mean	1983 Rank/ Mean	1982 Rank/ C ¹ /FD ² /FD1
1. Improve Argumentation Skills	1/4.12	3/3.86/2	10/C/09
2. Educational/Learning Experience	2/4.00	3/3.86/1	7/C/05
3. Intellectual Stimulation	3/3.94	3/3.86/0	11/C/08
4. Improve General Skills	4.5/3.88	6/3.76/1.5	18/ /13.5
5. Personal Fulfillment	4.5/3.88	8/3.68/3.5	29/ /24.5
6. Improve Communication Skills	6/3.79	7/3.69/1	4/C/02
7. Enjoyment	7/3.72	5/3.83/2	2/C/05
8. Improve Analytic Skills	8/3.71	9.5/3.60/1.5	5/C/06
9. Competition	9/3.68	1/3.88/8	1/C/08
10. Personal Motivation (FD subtotal)	10/3.62	15/3.15/5	26/ /15 96
11. Experience	11/3.58	12/3.49/1	15//04
12. Increase General Knowledge	12/3.46	11/3.50/1	12.5/ /1.5
13. Travel	13/3.31	15/3.15/2	3/C/10
14. Improve Research Skills	14/3.23	15/3.15/1	8/C/06
15. Winning	15/3.22	9.5/3.51/5.5	16/ /01
16. Improve Organizational Skills	16/3.17	13/3.23/3	14/ /02
17. Improve Confidence	17/3.15	17/3.07/0	26/ /09
18. Improve Listening Skills	18/3.10	18/3.00/0	31/ /13
19. Social Interaction	19/3.03	19/2.95/0	6/C/13
20. Team Camaraderie (FD subtotal)	20/2.92	20/2.94/0	17/ /03 61.5
21. Prestige	21/2.65	21/2.85/4	25//03
22. Increase Knowledge of Topic	22/2.64	23/2.74/1	12.5/ /19.5
23. Political Career	23.5/2.62	24/2.54/.5	27/ /3.5
24. Law School Preparation	23.5/2.62	22/2.81/1.5	9/C/14.5
25. Ego Gratification	25/2.57	25/2.67/3	21/ /04
26. Scholarship	26/2.52	26/2.52/0	22/ /04
27. References	27/2.33	27/2.16/0	19/ /08
28. Parties	28/2.13	28/2.15/0	32/ /04
29. Graduate School	29/1.93	29/1.97/0	28/ /01
30. Academic Credit (FD subtotal)	30/1.85	30/1.83/0	20/ /10 61.5
31. Money	31/1.46	31/1.66/0	23/ /08
32. Peer Pressure	32/1.19	32/1.26/0	30/ /02
33. Undetermined (FD subtotal)	N.A.	N.A.	24 0 10
FD TOTAL		49	229

¹C (Core Responses) accounted for 75% of all responses in the 1982 Hill study.

²FD (Factor of Displacement) is the difference between the 1982 and 1983 rankings and between the 1982 and 1987 rankings.

Next, the mean scores for the various categories are compared and ranked.⁴ Table 4 notes the categories by mean rank for the 1983 and 1987 surveys followed by the frequency with which these items appeared in the Hill (1982) study. The mean scores for each category are included and the categories are ranked for each of the three survey years. Educational Needs ranks highest among the categories in all three years. Competitive Needs ranks second in all three years. Personal Needs ranks third in 1983 and 1987 and ranks third and fourth in the 1982 survey. Career Preparation Needs ranks fourth in the 1983 and 1987 surveys and ranks fifth in the 1982 survey. That is, the category rankings remain constant across the three survey years.

ANOVAs and T-Tests were performed on the 1983 and 1987 survey data to determine if there were any statistically significant differences in the motivational influences between novice and varsity debaters (.05 level of significance). The analysis revealed statistically significant differences on three motivational influences. There were significant results for Educational/Learning Experience, Law School Preparation and Winning, but none revealed significance in both years of the survey. Novice debaters reported Education/Learning Experience to be more important than their varsity counterparts. This result is statistically significant in the 1987 survey (4.24 novice, 3.74 varsity, $p=.05$). The direction of the mean is reflected in the 1983 survey (3.98 novice, 3.74 varsity), but this difference was not statistically significant.

Varsity debaters perceived law school preparation as more important than novice debaters. The 1983 survey reported statistically significant differences on this item (3.15 varsity, 2.50 novice, $p=.002$) while the 1987 survey mirrored the direction of the means but did not reveal a significant difference (2.54 novice, 2.71 varsity).

Finally, varsity debaters perceived winning as more important than novice debaters. In 1983, the difference between novice and varsity debaters was significant (3.34 novice, 3.70 varsity, $p=.03$). The difference between novice and varsity debaters was not significant in 1987 though the means closely reflected the 1983 means (3.01 novice, 3.43 varsity).

ANOVAs and T-Tests were performed on the 1983 and 1987 survey data to determine differences in the motivational influences between CEDA and NDT debaters (.05 level of significance). The analysis revealed CEDA debaters found Educational/Learning

Table 4
Motivational Category and Item Comparisons

	1987 MEAN	1983 MEAN	1982 (Hill) FREQUENCY
I. EDUCATIONAL NEEDS			
1. Improve Argumentation Skills	4.12	3.86	10
2. Educational/Learning Experience	4.00	3.86	19
3. Intellectual Stimulation	3.94	3.86	9
4. Improve General Skills	3.88	3.76	5
5. Improve Communication Skills	3.79	3.69	29
6. Improve Analytic Skills	3.71	3.60	24
7. Increase General Knowledge	3.46	3.50	8
8. Improve Research Skills	3.23	3.15	17
9. Improve Organizational Skills	3.17	3.23	8
10. Improve Listening Skills	3.10	3.00	1
11. Increase Knowledge Of Topic	2.64	2.74	5
12. Academic Credit	1.85	1.83	3
Overall Category Mean	3.41	3.34	
Category Rank	1	1	1
II. COMPETITIVE NEEDS			
1. Competition	3.68	3.88	32
2. Winning	3.22	3.51	8
3. Prestige	2.65	2.83	2
4. Ego-gratification	2.57	2.67	3
Overall Category Mean	3.03	3.22	
Category Rank	2	2	2
III. PERSONAL NEEDS			
1. Personal Fulfillment	3.88	3.68	1
2. Enjoyment	3.72	3.83	31
3. Personal Motivation	3.63	3.15	2
4. Travel	3.31	3.15	31
5. Improve Confidence	3.17	3.07	2
6. Social Interaction	3.03	2.95	21
7. Team Camaraderie	2.92	2.94	6
8. Parties	2.13	2.15	1
9. Peer Pressure	1.19	1.26	1
Overall Category Mean	3.00	2.91	
Category Rank	3	3	3 & 4¹
IV. CAREER PREPARATION NEEDS			
1. Experience	3.58	2.81	8
2. Law School Preparation	2.62	2.81	14
3. Political Career	2.62	2.60	1
4. References	2.33	2.16	4
5. Graduate School	1.93	1.97	1
Overall Category Mean	2.62	2.60	
Category Rank	4	4	5

¹These items composed two separate categories in the original Hill study. They have been collapsed into one category for the purposes of this study.

Experience more important than did NDT debaters. The difference was statistically significant in both the 1983 and 1987 surveys (1983: 3.60 NDT/4.01 CEDA, $p=.016$; 1987: 3.83 NDT/4.03 CEDA, $p=.007$).

On four other items, statistically significant differences were reported in one of the two survey years. Intellectual Stimulation was more important for CEDA debaters in the 1983 survey (3.61 NDT/3.99 CEDA, $p=.025$). Self-confidence was more important for CEDA debaters in the 1983 survey (2.83 NDT/3.20 CEDA, $p=.05$). Communication Skills were more important for CEDA debaters in the 1983 survey (3.40 NDT/3.85 CEDA, $p=.007$). Finally, Argumentation Skills were more important for CEDA debaters in the 1987 survey (4.0 NDT/4.14 CEDA, $p=.05$).

DISCUSSION

In general, the results reveal a predictable hierarchy of motivational influences. The correlation among the 1982, 1983 and 1987 surveys is strong (see Table 2). The item correlation, with disparities represented by the Factor of Displacement, indicates that the correlation is stronger on some items and weaker on others (see Table 3). The implications of the item displacement are noted in the discussion of each research question.

The first research question asks: Do the core responses in the Hill (1982) study actually identify motivational influences? Partial confirmation for this question is found in this study. Hill identifies core responses (accounting for 75% of all responses) and seven of his eleven correspond with the top nine items in the 1983 and 1987 surveys. Nine of the eleven core responses correspond with the top fifteen items in the 1983 and 1987 surveys. By asking students to indicate the depth of commitment to the items identified by Hill, a new alignment of core items is generated.

Four of Hill's (1982) core responses were not supported in the 1983 and 1987 surveys. Preparation for Law School, Social Interaction, Travel and Improving Research Skills, when tested for depth of commitment, reflected significantly less importance for students than reported in the Hill study. That is, while a number of the 1982 students self-generated these items, the 1983 and 1987 students scored these items as relatively unimportant motivational influences.

Preparation for Law School ranked as the 9th core response for Hill (1982). Yet, in the 1983 and 1987 surveys, Preparation for Law School ranked 22 and 23.5 respectively with mean scores below 3.0 (1983=2.81, 1987=2.62). Law School Preparation exhib-

ited a strong FD (Factor of Displacement) with an FD=13 (comparing 1982 to 1983) and FD=14.5 (comparing 1982 to 1987). Social Interaction was the 6th ranked core response in Hill (1982). However, in both the 1983 and 1987 surveys, Social Interaction ranked 19th with means hovering around 3.0 (1983 = 2.95, 1987 = 3.03). The Factor of Displacement (FD = 13) notes the disparity between Hill's ranking of this core item and rankings of this study. Travel ranked as the 3rd highest core response in Hill (1982). However, the 1983 and 1987 surveys reflected a much lower ranking. With fairly robust means of 3.15 and 3.31, Travel ranked 15th and 13th with an FD = 12 and 14 respectively. Improving Research Skills was the 8th core response in the Hill study but ranked 15th (mean=3.15) in 1983 and 14th (mean=3.23) in 1987 (FD=7 in 1983 and FD=6 in 1987).

The realignment of core items may be explained in part by the different methodologies employed. For example, when students are asked to list the reasons why they debate, a "Law School Preparation" response is predictable because of its common association with debate (hence, Law School Preparation became a core response in the Hill [1982] study). However, when testing the depth of the commitment to law school as a motivational influence with a Likert-type scale (1983 and 1987 surveys), we find significantly lower means and ranking than predicted in the Hill study.

Furthermore, five items that rank in the top twelve in the 1983 and 1987 surveys were not identified as core responses in the Hill (1982) study. Personal Fulfillment, Improving General Skills, Personal Motivation, Experience and Increased General Knowledge, when tested for depth of commitment, suggest that these items were reported as core motivations for participation in debate.

Personal Fulfillment ranked 13th in the Hill (1982) study but ranked 8th and 4.5 in the 1983 and 1987 surveys (FD=5 to 9.5). Improving General Skills ranked 18th in the Hill study but ranked 6th in the 1983 and 4.5 in the 1987 surveys (FD=12 to 13.5). Clearly, Personal Fulfillment and Improving General Skills were important motivational factors not revealed in the Hill study. Personal Motivation which ranked 10th in the 1987 survey and 15th in the 1983 survey ranked 25th (FD=15 and 10) in the 1982 study. Experience, ranked 15th by Hill, ranked 11th in 1987 and 12th in 1983. While the disparity in ranking for Experience was not great (FD=4 and 3), the means for this item in 1983 (3.49) and 1987 (3.58) suggested a strong affinity for this item which was not among Hill's core responses. The same argument is true for Increasing General Knowledge. While Hill's study and the 1987

survey ranked this item 12th (the 1983 survey ranked it 11th), the means suggest a strong affinity for Increasing General Knowledge (1983=3.50, 1987=3.46). However, the Hill study did not identify Increasing General Knowledge as a core response.

Thus, the 1983 and 1987 surveys provide partial confirmation for the range of motivational influences affecting debaters as initially identified by Hill (1982). The hierarchy of these influences is refined by the data from the 1983 and 1987 surveys. The data suggest that in addition to modifying the hierarchy of motives identified by Hill, the notion of core items is nebulous. Clearly, the mean of 1.19 for Peer Pressure suggests a non-core item as clearly as a mean of 4.12 for Improving Argumentation Skills suggests a core item. The extremes are easy to identify but a line of demarcation between core items and non-core items is subjective and not necessarily productive.

The data support the grouping of items into categories. Even with some re-organization of Hill's (1982) categories, the correlation of group rankings among the 1982, 1983 and 1987 surveys is exact (see Table 4). Education Needs ranks first with category means of 3.34 (1983) and 3.41 (1987). Competitive Needs ranks second with category means of 3.22 (1983) and 3.03 (1987). The correlation of the category rankings among the 1982, 1983 and 1987 surveys strengthens the claim that students perceive educational needs as more important than competitive needs.

The second research question asks: "Do the motivational influences differ or shift as a function of time?" In the five year span of these three surveys, few differences, if any, can be attributed to time. The differences between the Hill (1982) study and the 1983 survey could be attributed to methodological differences as easily as the passage of time. The few differences in rankings between the 1983 and 1987 surveys, while not confounded by differences in methodology, are minor and may not be predictive of change over time. The trend for there to be fewer statistically significant differences between CEDA and NDT debaters from 1983 to 1987 may be a result of time. That is, the perceived differences between CEDA and NDT may be diminishing as a function of time. (These differences are discussed in greater detail in the section on CEDA and NDT.) Within the time span studied, the motivational influences affecting students involvement in intercollegiate debate seem fairly stable.

The third research question asks: "Will there be differences in motivational influences reported by novice and varsity debaters?" The results indicate that there are few differences between novices

and varsity debaters in terms of motivational influences. Novices find Educational/Learning Experience more important than do varsity debaters in the 1987 survey and the means are in the same direction in the 1983 survey. Thus, novices may perceive the influence of debate as a more important educational and learning experience than do varsity debaters. This conclusion must be tempered by noting that the means on this item are high for both novice and varsity debaters. The data reveal that varsity debaters perceive this influence as important, but not quite as important as do novice debaters.

Varsity debaters perceived Law School Preparation and Winning as more important than novice debaters. While their differences in perception only reach statistical significance in one of the two survey years, their means are in the same direction in the other year. Such a finding is not surprising. Debaters who continue with the activity over time may more naturally accept the "gaming" nature of debate as well as perceive the utility it offers for law school preparation. These are tentative conclusions because statistically significant results occur in only one of the two survey years. What is more important is the low ranking Law School Preparation has in both the 1983 and 1987 studies. While it may be slightly more important for varsity debaters, preparation for law school does not seem to be a very strong motivating influence.

Winning, on the other hand, ranked in the middle of the motivational influences and was more important for varsity debaters than for novice debaters (statistically significant in 1983). This finding may be reflective of Ehrlich's (1972) thesis that winning is a learned priority for debaters and thus we would expect to find experienced debaters more concerned with winning. The data suggest that, while winning seems to be more important for varsity debaters than for novice debaters, winning is only a moderate motivational influence.

The fourth research question asks: "Will there be differences in motivational influences reported by CEDA and NDT debaters?" The data show five areas of possible differences. The first and strongest difference is on the item of Education and Learning Experience. In both years, students involved in CEDA debate reported this item to be significantly more important than students involved in NDT debate. Taken at face value this finding may not be surprising. CEDA was founded in order to promote educational goals that NDT had allegedly neglected. However, such an observation may be misleading. First, there is nothing inherently non-educational in NDT. Second, the mean scores suggest that

Education is very important to NDT debaters. Third, the data do not reveal any tendency for NDT debaters to perceive the offsetting value of competition as significantly more important than CEDA debaters. So, while CEDA debaters may value educational goals more than NDT debaters, both groups found the educational goals potent and more important than competition.

The other items which show statistical significance in at least one of the two survey years add support to the importance CEDA debaters attach to the educational oriented motivations. Intellectual Stimulation, Self-Confidence, Communication Skills, and Argumentation Skills are all more important for CEDA debaters than NDT debaters. Although these results are statistically significant in only one of the two years, the means in the opposite year are in the same direction. Since three of these four differences occurred in the 1983 survey and only one in the 1987 survey, there may actually be a lessening of differences in motivational influences between CEDA and NDT debaters. This is an important observation that should be tested over time.

CONCLUSION

This research prompts several conclusions. The 1982, 1983 and 1987 surveys reveal not only the range of motivational influences, but the depth of commitment students have toward each of these influences. Second, we have additional information on how these motivational influences cluster into categories and the stability of the ranking of these categories. Third, we can conclude that between the 1983 and 1987 surveys, no significant changes in the reported motivational influences could be attributed to time other than the possibility of decreasing differences between CEDA and NDT. Fourth, we can conclude that few differences exist between novice and varsity debaters. Fifth, few differences in the motivational influences of CEDA and NDT debaters exist and seem to be decreasing. Sixth, we can conclude that at least from a student perspective, the educational goals of debate are more important than the competitive goals.

The rationale for traditionally placing debate programs in speech communication departments is strengthened by this research. Debate programs are established and operated as educational activities and the student response reflects that philosophy. CEDA and NDT debate programs share relatively equal and viable pedagogical ground that places educational goals above competitive goals.

The information on motivational influences derived from this study is useful to administrators, speech colleagues and directors of debate programs. This research can serve as a barometer of attitudes and suggest pedagogical revision, reformation or confirmation of debate programs. Further, and perhaps most importantly, this study suggests that the basic educational rationale for student involvement in debate remains sound.

FUTURE RESEARCH

Future research on motivational influences is necessary for two basic reasons. First, the conclusions of this study need to be confirmed or modified over time. Students in the late 1980's or 1990's may not be motivated to participate in intercollegiate debate for the same reasons identified in this study.

Second, methodological refinements are suggested by this study. Several areas can be explored in future research. The division of debaters into novice and varsity categories could be replaced with more sensitive controls for age and class standing. The survey could be administered to debaters in non-competitive environments, as well as competitive settings, to control for effects that may be caused by the unique conditions of debate tournaments. Additional controls for attribute variables such as male/female students involved in debate could help determine strategies for attracting a balance of male and female participants. The survey could be administered to a control group of non-debaters to compare the perceptions of the student population not involved in debate. This could help identify strategies for attracting more students to debate and identifying why more competitively-minded students do not participate in debate.

The tension between winning and pedagogy in academic debate identified in 1915 continues to exist. The results of this study, however, reinforce the role of debate in the speech communication field and as a fundamental part of the larger educational mission of colleges and universities. Administrators, speech colleagues, coaches and students should be aware that students who debate attribute their motivation for debating first and foremost to educational objectives.

Notes

¹Self-report research is examined in critical detail by Hample (1984). Hample notes the weaknesses and strengths of self-report research and concludes that "we should treat all verbal reports with some skepticism . . . the answer may well be interesting but not because they answer the questions accurately" (153).

²A novice was operationally defined as a student in his or her first year of competitive debate. A varsity debater was operationally defined as a student with more than one year of competitive debate experience.

³Hill's (1982) mean scores are more potent as they approach 1.00 and less potent as they approach 5.00. In the current study, the reverse is true, the closer a mean score is to 5.00 the more potent the score.

⁴Hill (1982) identified six "broad" categories: Educational Needs, Social Needs, Competitive Needs, Career Preparation Needs, Miscellaneous Needs, and Financial Needs. For the purposes of clarity, these six categories are reduced to four: Educational Needs, Competitive Needs, Personal Needs, and Career Preparation Needs. The Miscellaneous Needs category was collapsed into the Personal Needs category. Items such as Improving Self-Confidence, Personal Motivation, Peer Pressure and Personal Fulfillment fit logically into a Personal Needs category. The Financial Needs category was not included since the category consisted of only two items which ranked low in the 1982, 1983 and 1987 surveys (Scholarships and Money were collapsed into the Financial Needs category).

References

- Brownlee, D. (1985). The value of competition: A reply to Rowland. *Journal of the American Forensic Association* 21, 116-118.
- Colbert, K. (1987). The effects of CEDA and NDT debate training on critical thinking ability. *Journal of the American Forensic Association* 23, 194-201.
- Colbert, K. and T. Biggers (1985). Why should we support debate? *Journal of the American Forensic Association* 21, 237-240.
- Cormier, S. M. (1986). *Basic processes of learning, cognition, and motivation*. NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Douglass, D. G. (1972). A need for review: Forensic studies in contemporary speech education. *Journal of the American Forensic Association* 9, 178-181.
- Ehrlich, L. (1972). Philosophical risk in the forensic art. *Journal of the American Forensic Association* 9, 266-273.
- Gow, J. E. (1967). Tournament debating: A time for changes. *Journal of the American Forensic Association* 4, 107-111.
- Haiman, F. S. (1964). A critical view of the game of forensics. *Journal of the American Forensic Association* 1, 62-66.
- Hample, D. (1984). On the use of self-reports. *Journal of the American Forensic Association* 20, 140-153.
- Hildreth, R. (1961). Personality characteristics of debaters. *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 41, 398-401.
- Hill, B. (1982). Intercollegiate debate: Why do students bother? *The Southern Speech Communication Journal* 48, 77-88.
- Kelley, B. M. (1981). An alternative to NDT debate. *CEDA Yearbook*. 8-14.
- King, T. R., and G. Phifer (1968). The college debater as seen by himself and his peers. *Journal of the American Forensic Association* 5, 48-52.
- Konigsberg, E. (1935). What should be our objective in high school debating? *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 21, 392-96.
- Lane, F. H. (1915). Faculty help in intercollegiate contests. *Quarterly Journal of Public Speech* 1, 9-16.

Lawson, H. (1989). Value and policy debate. *Prima Facie* (2nd) (eds. S. Wood and J. Midgley). Dubuque: Kendall/Hunt, 17-24.

Louden, A. D. and C. C. Austin (1983). CEDA not NDT: A dysfunctional myth. *CEDA Yearbook*. 6-12.

McGlone, E. L. (1974). The behavioral effects of forensic participation. *Journal of the American Forensic Association* 10, 140-146.

Pelham, H. (1972). The justification for debate must be expanded. *Speaker and Gavel* 9, 45-7.

Pelham, W. D., and W. Watt (1989). Profile of academic debate. *Prima Facie* (2nd) (eds. S. Wood and J. Midgley). Dubuque: Kendall/Hunt, 3-15.

Rowland, R. C. (1985). The need for rapprochement between NDT and CEDA debate. *Journal of the American Forensic Association* 21, 114-115.

Swanson, D. R. (1981). Reflections on CEDA debate—1980-1981. *CEDA Yearbook*. 15-17.

Tucker, R. K., J. Koehler and L. Mlady (1967). The image of the college debater. *Journal of the American Forensic Association* 4, 1-9.

Wilson, J. L. (1979). Competitiveness of the intercollegiate debaters: A multivariate analysis. *Journal of the American Forensic Association* 15, 148-55.

**FACTORS AFFECTING CHOICES AMONG
NATIONAL TOURNAMENTS:
REPORT ON A SURVEY***

*Mary Ann Renz and Keith D. Green **

In the "individual events" community, national tournaments are long past their infancy, but not yet near middle age. This academic year will see the twentieth annual National Forensic Association's Individual Events Nationals. The American Forensic Association first hosted its National Individual Events Tournament in 1978, making this year's tournament its thirteenth. While adolescence is often a period of turbulence, the adolescence of these national tournaments seems less troubled; each appears sound, with a strong sense of the future. Nonetheless, a careful evaluation of the state of national tournament competition is not out of order. To help determine perception of tournament strengths and chart directions for the future, this article will examine reactions of individual events coaches to the national tournaments and to the desirability of maintaining two separate national tournaments, in addition to those hosted by forensic honoraries. This article is based on responses to a survey mailed to the membership of the National Forensic Association and the American Forensic Association during August of 1988.

Justification

Three factors justify this line of research: 1) the saliency of the issue, 2) the need to discover members' views, and 3) the opportunity to direct tournament evolution.

Saliency of the issue

The issue of national tournaments is one which has high saliency in the individual events community. From the time when initial travel schedules and budgets are prepared for an upcoming season to the time when national champions have been determined, the national tournaments are the focus of a good deal of informal discussion. At tournaments throughout the year, students and coaches alike discuss what distinguishes one national tournament from the other, which national tournament to support, and

**The National Forensic Journal, VII (Fall, 1989), pp. 99-113.*

MARY ANN RENZ is Assistant Professor in Communication and Theatre Arts at Winona State University, Winona, MN 55987; KEITH D. GREEN is Instructor and Assistant Director of Forensics in Speech Communication at Manhatto State University in Mankato, MN 56001.

whether it is wiser to attend only one or both national tournaments. The informal talk achieved a more formal status at the opening meeting of the 1988 NFA's I.E. Nationals when AFA President, Pat Ganer, responding to an invitation from tournament host, Clark Olson, broached the subject of detente between the two national organizations. While some reactions she received indicated a sense that the message was inappropriate, at least in that context, far more welcomed the tenor of her remarks.¹

Even the survey results provide, *ex post facto*, a justification for the research on grounds of saliency. In response to an open-ended question which sought reactions to the survey, several respondents noted the importance of the issue and expressed their interest in seeing the results in print.

Medium for expression of membership views

Despite the high saliency of this issue, few formal channels have been available for communicating membership views. It is true that both the AFA and the NFA hold business meetings at the Speech Communication Association convention, and the NFA incorporates a general business meeting at its national tournament. If the context for those meetings encourages critical self-examination of tournament practices, it does less to encourage the more radical issue: questioning the basic premises of the organizations themselves to ascertain whether separate nationals remain desirable.

The nature of the issue makes it the more logical subject for a developmental conference. Yet all of the recommendations of the 1988 Developmental Conference on Individual Events involving the national tournaments accepted the current arrangement of two separate nationals as a given.² Our surveys provided a channel for expression of members' views.

Opportunity for directed evolution

In the informal comments made about national tournaments throughout the year, more than one person has predicted that, with time, the issue of two nationals will be resolved by the demise of one of the national tournaments. Regardless of the accuracy of such predictions, it seems preferable for the individual events community to take action to ensure the health of national tournament competition rather than to wait for the funeral of a tournament.

If the interests of the community lie with the maintenance of two separate national tournaments, then it is important that each organization have the opportunity to discover which characteristics

of its tournament are regarded highly, so that they can be retained and strengthened, and to discover which are regarded poorly, so they can be modified. The surveys asked questions which would generate information useful in identifying perceptions of several tournament characteristics; tournament modification could be directed in ways desired by the forensics community.

If, on the other hand, the interests of the forensics community lie with unification of national tournament competition, then it is important to identify the qualities sought in a national tournament so that creation of a new entity might proceed in a direction which would meet the needs and interests of the individual events community.

It was not the intention of this survey to presume a direction for the individual events community in creation of the ideal national tournament(s). It was our premise, however, that "genetic engineering" of the ideal tournament(s) would be preferable to awaiting the outcome of a battle for survival of the fittest.

Methodology

Surveys were sent to the mailing lists of the National Forensic Association and the American Forensic Association in August, 1988, to be returned in late September. (See Appendix A.) In total, 307 surveys were mailed, two of which were returned by the Postal Service marked as undeliverable. One hundred four surveys were returned and tabulated, making the return rate 34.1%. (Two additional surveys were returned long after the deadline, and after all tabulations were complete; these surveys are not included in the results.)

An effort was made to include the broadest possible response, rather than to equalize responses from NFA and AFA members. The mailing list included 74 schools (24.1%) with memberships in both NFA and AFA, 143 (46.6%) AFA-only schools, and 90 (29.3%) NFA-only schools. The affiliation of schools responding is indicated in Table 1. Obviously, the returns did not parallel precisely the national tournament affiliation profile. The high return rate (89.1%) for those schools holding memberships in both organizations led to the largest discrepancy and, in the process, reflects the high saliency of the issue for schools with memberships in both the AFA and the NFA. The increased familiarity of the respondents with both organizations' national tournaments may be an advantage for the survey results. Schools with AFA memberships exceeded those with NFA memberships on the original mailing lists, and return rates increased that discrepancy. Therefore, a

bias toward AFA-style national competition would be anticipated in the response.

Table 1: National Organization Affiliation

Organization	School Membership		Personal Involvement	
	N	Percentage	N	Percentage
American Forensic Association	95	(91.35%)	67	(64.42%)
National Forensic Association	71	(68.27%)	32	(30.77%)
Delta Sigma Rho/ Tau Kappa Alpha	32	(30.77%)	16	(15.38%)
Pi Kappa Delta	41	(39.42%)	40	(38.46%)
Phi Rho Pi	10	(9.62%)	9	(8.65%)
Both AFA and NFA	66	(63.46%)	21	(20.19%)

Results

Importance of national tournaments

Many times, the focus of a full year's competition seems to be on both qualifying and preparing for attendance at national tournaments. Question 6 attempted to discover whether national tournaments do hold a (philosophically) central role in programs. Table 2 confirms that they do; 89.42% of the respondents feel attendance at a national tournament is either desirable or essential for their programs. Thus, it seems important that the national tournament experience should be the best it can possibly be.

Table 2: Importance of National Tournament Participation

Essential for the program	29	(27.99%)
Desirable for the program	64	(61.54%)
Optional for the program	9	(1.65%)
Unimportant for the program	1	(0.96%)
Undesirable for the program	0	(0.00%)

National tournament affiliation

The survey identified national tournament affiliation through questions about past and projected tournament attendance.

Table 3 summarizes the results of questions 3 and 4. The responses suggest that a sizable increase in AFA tournament affiliation is anticipated. Caution should attend the interpretation of these results. First, a comparison of Tables 1 and 3 reveals that, even if 71 of the respondents' schools attended AFA in 1989, 24 additional affiliates still did not anticipate attending. Second, the difference between actual attendance and anticipated attendance should be considered. The potential of an upcoming year's squad may appear more brilliant in August or September than it actually becomes during the year of competition. A comparison of two years' actual attendance might provide different results. Third, the survey responses do not provide evidence of disaffection for NFA and a movement toward AFA. When asked why they intended to change national tournament affiliation, only three respondents mentioned a characteristic of the tournament in question as factors responsible for a predicted attendance shift. Those three identified convenient tournament dates, pleasant people, and strong competition at the tournament; the first two reasons do not seem inherent qualities of any one particular national tournament as opposed to the other, and most respondents revealed that both tournaments have strong competition.

Table 3: National Tournament Attendance

Tournament	1987-1988 Attendance		1988-1989 Anticipated Attendance	
	N	Percentage	N	Percentage
AFA-N.I.E.T.	49	(47.12%)	71	(68.27%)
NFA I.E. Nationals	50	(41.08%)	48	(46.15%)
DSR-TKA	19	(18.27%)	21	(20.19%)
Pi Kappa Delta	20	(19.23%)	32	(30.77%)
Phi Rho Pi	9	(8.65%)	11	(10.58%)
Both AFA and NFA	25	(24.04%)	28	(26.92%)

The most frequent explanations for differences between the previous year's national tournament attendance and the coming year's tournament attendance were differences in tournament distances, budgetary constraints, and changes in the school's squad (each mentioned by thirteen respondents). Changes in the squad included improved student abilities, increased time commitment from students, increased program size, and change in program directorship. The jump in projected PKD attendance obvious in

Table 3 is explained by ten of the responses, which mentioned that national tournament attendance at PKD would occur in 1989, since there would *be* a national tournament, in contrast with the province tournament held in 1987.

In some programs which affiliate with both national tournaments, one is given higher priority and is therefore funded by a more secure or "preferred" funding source. Question 7 sought evidence of such "preferential treatment." As Table 4 indicates, little evidence of preferential funding patterns exists. Most programs used the same kind of resources for funding each tournament attended. Separate university funds and alumni funds do appear to have financed slightly more AFA travel than NFA travel (despite the fact that one more of the respondents attended NFA in 1988 than attended AFA). The larger number of AFA respondents may explain this difference. Team fundraising efforts are a somewhat more frequent means of funding NFA, perhaps necessitated by the increased expenses due both to increased length of that tournament and (frequently) greater squad size at NFA. Two respondents indicated that national tournament funding occurred through coaches' absorption of expenses; this is troublesome, particularly if any trend develops in this direction.

Table 4: Funding for National Tournaments

Form of Funding	AFA		NFA		Forensic Honorary
Covered by regular budget	40	(38.46%)	40	(38.46%)	34 (32.69%)
Covered by separate University fund	20	(19.23%)	16	(15.39%)	12(11.54%)
Covered by alumni gifts or foundation	6	(5.79%)	4	(3.85%)	3 (2.88%)
Generated by team fundraising	11	(10.58%)	15	(14.42%)	9 (8.65%)
Absorbed by students	6	(5.77%)	4	(3.85%)	5 (4.80%)
Other (special funds, or absorbed by coach)	3	(2.88%)	3	(2.88%)	2 (1.92%)

Criteria affecting national tournament selection

Questions 8 and 9 attempted to discover which factors are used to determine which and how many national tournaments are attended. Therefore, we asked not only for a response to a list of

criteria *per se*, but also sought to discover whether the importance of a criterion used to decide *which* national tournament to attend differed from its importance in deciding *how many* national tournaments to attend. Many respondents marked the criteria identically in the two situations. As a result, most of the factors stayed within a rank or two of the same position, whether a single national or multiple national tournaments were being considered. The exceptions to the rule are predictable: funds increase as a consideration when more than a single national tournament is being considered, forcing considerations of tournament quality to become secondary. The greatest increase in frequency of a single item came with the "size of my coaching staff." Apparently, when a coaching staff begins to consider devoting two (or more) weeks to national tournament competition at season's end, the philosophical issues of commitment to tournament philosophy and perceived tournament quality (and even the "luxury" consideration of tournament location's desirability) give way to the crass, pragmatic issues: can we survive this? can we afford it? and can we place high enough to make it worthwhile?

Perception of national tournament characteristics

Once a program has chosen national tournament affiliation(s), the program begins to be influenced by a range of tournament characteristics. The NFA and AFA have made a point of maintaining quite distinct tournaments. In some cases, specific distinguishing characteristics are no more closely associated with the philosophy of one tournament than of another, but nonetheless serve to maintain distinct tournament identities. Question 10 sought to discover whether there were differences in the perception of the two tournaments and how many perceived differences were evaluated. The results are evident in Table 6. They indicate that differences in perception of the tournaments certainly exist. No item received the same overall ranking for both tournaments.

Agenda for the national tournament organizations

Since the responses to question 10 can provide an agenda for tournament improvement through evolution, some interpretation of these results is appropriate. Interpretation, however, is complicated by the biased and non-random affiliations of those who ranked the tournament characteristics. Strict comparison of the results would be meaningless; therefore, three strategies were used to identify strengths and weaknesses of the tournaments. First, it

Table 5: Factors Considered in Selecting National Tournaments**If Limited to a Single Nationals If More Than A Single Nationals**

	Frequency		Rank by Frequency	Mean	Rank by Mean	Frequency		Rank by Frequency	Mean	Rank by Mean
Proximity of the tournament to my campus	51	(49.94)	5	4.4	4	54	(51.92)	5	4.39	5
Desirability of the tournament location (historical significance, physical beauty, climate, entertainment, etc.)	25	(24.04)	10	5.41	10	21	(20.19)	10	5.46	11
Number of students qualified for the tournament	59	(56.73)	3	4.01	3	60	(57.69)	2	4.09	3
Ease of attaining funds to attend	52	(50.00)	4	4.5	6	58	(55.77)	3	4.02	2
Size of my coaching staff	6	(5.77)	12	5.90	12	17	(16.35)	11	5.25	10
Commitment to the philosophy of the tournament	62	(59.62)	2	3.69	1	58	(55.77)	3	3.97	1
Length of time required away	44	(42.31)	7	4.85	7	48	(46.15)	6	4.61	6
Events offered at the tournament	34	(32.69)	8	5.15	8	39	(37.50)	8	5.13	9
Perceived quality of the tournament	72	(69.23)	1	3.87	2	66	(63.46)	1	4.10	4
Perceived chance of student success	30	(28.85)	9	5.37	9	35	(33.65)	9	5.18	9
Perceived quality of tournament management	45	(43.27)	6	4.80	6	44	(42.31)	7	4.83	7
Other (date, prestige, etc.)	8	(7.69)	11	5.68	11	5	(4.81)	12	5.80	12

Table 6: Level of Agreement with Descriptions of AFA and NFA National Tournaments

(1 = Strongly agree; 2 = Agree; 3 = Neutral; 4 = Disagree; 5 = Strongly disagree. "+" means the statement has a positive valence and agreement would be anticipated; "-" means the statement has a negative valence and disagreement is anticipated.)

Item	AFA Mean	NFA Mean
This tournament is too long (+)	3.57	2.31
Tournament administration is excellent (+)	1.77	1.99
Quality of competition with sections is unbalanced (-)	3.40	2.52
Quality of competition at the tournament is below my expectations (-)	3.90	3.13
Final rounds provide models of excellent forensic performance (+)	1.54	1.71
This tournament emphasizes quality competition (+)	1.52	2.69
This tournament emphasizes broad participation (+)	3.19	1.44
Qualification procedures for this tournament are too lenient (-)	4.37	2.83
Qualification procedures for this tournament are too stringent (-)	3.25	4.44
The events offered are too limited (-)	4.04	3.80
I consider this to be "the" national tournament (+)	2.67	3.21
The coding of competitors makes it too easy to identify their school affiliation (-)	3.06	3.70
The method of coding competitors is inappropriate (-)	2.74	2.35
The policy on the number of events a student can do is appropriate (+)	2.43	2.16
The number of rounds I am required to judge is excessive (-)	3.32	2.58
The judging pool is of high quality (+)	2.53	2.62
The scoring system allows for maximum discrimination of contestants (+)	2.86	2.63
This tournament is attractive because of its social amenities (+)	2.70	3.24
My past experience at this tournament has been pleasant (+)	1.81	2.08
My students perceive this tournament to promise them the greatest chance of success (+)	2.63	2.39
I like the policy of this tournament in computing sweepstakes points (+).	2.75	2.30

was assumed that tournament administrators might be concerned if a statement with a positive valence (e.g., "Tournament administration is excellent") was deemed not to describe a particular tournament (that is, receives a mean score greater than 3.0), or if a statement with a negative valence (e.g., "This tournament is too long") is deemed to describe the tournament (that is, receives a mean score of less than 3.0). Using this criterion, the responses suggest that the AFA might consider ways of emphasizing broader participation and that the NFA might consider ways of shortening its tournament, improving balance of competitive quality among preliminary round sections, making qualification procedures somewhat more rigorous, reducing judging demands on coaches, and incorporating some social amenities into the tournament. While this list of "suggested improvements" creates a far longer agenda for the NFA than it does for the AFA, two factors should be recognized. First, the perceived "difficulties" all seem to revolve around the single issue of current NFA qualification standards. Second, the heavy AFA bias of the respondents clearly affects their evaluation of these characteristics.

The AFA bias encourages use of a second strategy to highlight strengths and weaknesses deserving attention. Items were identified for which the NFA had a higher ranking than did AFA (that is, closer to a "5" for a negatively valenced item and closer to "1" for a positively valenced item). This criterion would add to the AFA's agenda efforts to accomplish the following: reduce the stringency of its qualification procedures; reduce the ease of competitor identification via the coding system; increase the ability to discriminate among contestants with the scoring system; alter limits on the number of events overall or within brackets in which competitors may compete; and alter the means of computing sweepstakes.

The third strategy was used to identify additional areas of strength not already implied by the other strategies. Each organization should want to maintain and strengthen these qualities. Items were identified which received a mean score of "2" or less for positively valenced items and a mean of "4" or more for negatively valenced items. This technique identified NFA's emphasis on broad participation, AFA's emphasis on quality of competition, the breadth of events offered, and the creation of a pleasant overall experience as strengths. Both organizations were viewed positively for the excellence of their tournament administration and the quality of their final round competition.

Aside from improving the quality of the national tournaments, the survey suggested that both the NFA and the AFA have room for attracting personal commitment from the individual events community. The data in Table 1 reveal that Pi Kappa Delta and Phi Rho Pi seem to accomplish high levels of personal involvement, since only one school with membership in each reported no personal professional involvement in the organization. For DSR-TKA and the NFA, the percentages dropped to 50% and 45% respectively. Although the AFA professional memberships were higher (70%), the significant drop among those with both AFA and NFA memberships (a signal of high individual events involvement) leads us to believe that debate affiliations of forensic directors account for some of the higher involvement in the AFA on a professional level. The professional affiliation of only 31.8% by individuals who hold school memberships in both the AFA and the NFA raises questions about whether it is possible for those with heavy involvement in individual events to maintain personal/professional involvements in both organizations or whether the organizations themselves are serving and/or using the services of such heavily involved coaches as effectively as possible. Apart from their tournament activities, the AFA and the NFA should recognize the opportunity to improve service to and professional involvement of individual events coaches.

Support for unification of national tournaments

Given the support for the NFA's breadth of participation on the one hand and the AFA's competitive quality on the other, union of the two organizations may seem unlikely. However, question 11 asked whether the individual events community would be supportive of unification efforts. The results, shown in Table 7, indicate divergence of opinion, but strong support for a joint national tournament; in fact, more than half of the respondents approved of the idea. Those respondents affiliated only with the AFA were strongest in their support, yet others also indicated considerable support.

Respondents were asked in question 12 to identify their reasons for supporting or opposing a joint tournament. Four respondents voiced their need to know more about its nature before indicating any degree of support for a single national tournament. The comments of those who supported the concept fall into five categories. Twenty respondents mentioned the financial advantage of a single tournament; an equal number referred to the benefit of

Table 7: Support for Joint Hosting by AFA and NFA of a Single National Tournament

Question: If AFA-NIET and NFA were to jointly host one national tournament for individual events, how would you feel about it?

	Schools with neither AFA nor NFA affiliation		Schools with AFA-only affiliation		Schools with NFA-only affiliation		Schools with both AFA and NFA affiliation		TOTAL RESPONSES	
Strongly support	0	(0.0%)	9	(32.1%)	0	(0.0%)	22	(33.3%)	31	(29.80%)
Support	1	(20.0%)	9	(32.1%)	2	(40.0%)	11	(16.7%)	23	(22.16%)
Neutral (includes undecided)	3	(60.0%)	2	(7.1%)	1	(20.0%)	10	(15.2%)	16	(15.38%)
Oppose	0	(0.0%)	5	(17.9%)	1	(20.0%)	20	(30.3%)	26	(25.00%)
Strongly oppose	1	(20.0%)	3	(10.7%)	1	(20.0%)	3	(4.5%)	8	(7.69%)

having a "truly national tournament" which would determine the "real" national champions. The next most common comments, mentioned by fourteen respondents, related to administrative advantages: shorter seasons, reduced absence of students from classes, increased likelihood of administrative support, and increased convenience. Ten respondents reasoned that a single national tournament would create unity and show common sense, as it ended the split between the two organizations. Four respondents claimed that a single nationals would result in improved quality.

Opposing arguments fell into six categories. The most frequent basis for opposition (10 respondents) was that unification would eliminate the value of having two different philosophies. Nine respondents based their opposition on their perception that philosophical agreement between the AFA and the NFA would be impossible. An equal number mentioned the administrative difficulty of handling a larger tournament. The possible expense of a national tournament when no choice of geographic alternatives would be available led to opposition by six respondents. Two feared that a single national tournament would decrease quality; two others voiced concern that unification would produce an elitist tournament or one which might discriminate against smaller schools.

In question 13, respondents were asked to identify the characteristics that any joint national tournament should possess. The following list includes concerns noted:

- Administrative quality (a well-run, fairly-run tournament with good facilities, good food, quality judging, and humane judging schedules—all at a reasonable cost).
- Quality competition (specific qualification standards were a point of contention; 23 recommended tighter, AFA-style standards; 11 recommended standards midway between those used by the AFA and the NFA; 7 suggested NFA-style standards. Some suggested using the AFA-NDT model for qualification; others recommended using brackets or divisions at the tournament).
- Location (easy to reach or central, perhaps an historical, educational or a "fun" location).
- Tournament length (reasonably short; some suggested octo-finals).
- Breadth of competitive events and some social activities.
- Coding to increase competitor anonymity.

- Sweepstakes (including preliminary rounds; a tiered sweepstakes system).
- Strong, clear educational philosophy.

This list is not universally endorsed, but it does identify areas where negotiation would be necessary during efforts at unification.

Conclusion

The survey results suggest that each national tournament is viewed positively by the individual events community. Both tournaments received high marks for administrative excellence. Certainly there is no sense that "ANYTHING would be better than what we have now."

Nonetheless, more than half of those surveyed support the concept of a unified national tournament. Of the five options for response, the one receiving the most votes was the category of strong support for a unified national tournament. The support for such a change was high even among those who currently hold membership in both national organizations. Some opposed the idea of unification because they believe maintaining two separate philosophical approaches to national tournaments is desirable. Nearly as many based their opposition on an assumption that unification is an impossibility. Therefore, if negotiations between the two organizations were to succeed, this cause for opposition would disappear. Responses to the open-ended questions provide some hope for the possibility of compromise. The key point needing negotiation, of course, is the standard for qualification.

Individual events directors' visions of "the ideal national tournament" involve a blending of the characteristics of the two current national tournaments. To the extent that this is true, efforts toward unification might hold some promise. To explore the possibility would please more than half of those who responded to the survey. The survey suggests that efforts toward unification would not be easy, but it does give reason to encourage the attempt. One respondent to the survey wrote, "One nationals is a superb idea whose time has come." Perhaps it is at least time to discover whether what separates the organizations is truly an abyss, or instead, a division much more negotiable.

Notes

¹Telephone interview with Pat Ganer, October, 1988.

²Larry Schnoor and Vicki Karns, Editors, *Perspective on Individual Events: Proceedings of the First Developmental Conference on Individual Events, August 18-20, 1988* (Mankato, MN: Mankato State University Speech Department, 1989). As an example, a panel on the "Role of Graduate Assistants in the IE Program" suggested that forensics organizations "consider carefully whether first year Graduate Assistants should be used as judges at national tournaments" (p. 108). This recommendation parallels others in its acceptance of the continued existence of multiple national tournaments.

APPENDIX A: SAMPLE SURVEY
 NATIONAL TOURNAMENTS IN INDIVIDUAL EVENTS: A SURVEY

1. In which of these national organizations does your school have a membership?
 ___ APA ___ NFA ___ DSR-TKA ___ Pi Kappa Delta ___ Phi Rho Pi
2. In which of these national organizations do you have a personal professional involvement?
 ___ APA ___ NFA ___ DSR-TKA ___ Pi Kappa Delta ___ Phi Rho Pi
3. Which of these national tournaments did your team attend during the 1987-88 forensic season?
 ___ APA ___ NFA ___ DSR-TKA ___ Pi Kappa Delta ___ Phi Rho Pi
4. Which of these national tournaments do you anticipate your team attending this coming spring?
 ___ APA ___ NFA ___ DSR-TKA ___ Pi Kappa Delta ___ Phi Rho Pi
5. If you anticipate that your team's national tournament attendance will differ in the 1988-89 season from that in the 1987-88, please explain why.
6. Circle the word which best completes the following statement:
 "National tournament attendance is _____ for our individual events program."
 a. essential b. desirable c. optional d. unimportant e. undesirable
7. For each of the 1987-88 national tournaments you attended, were your costs (check all that are appropriate):
 AFA NFA Forensic honorary
 a. covered by a regular year's budget _____
 b. covered by a separate university's fund _____
 c. covered by alumni foundation/alumni gifts _____
 d. generated by team fundraising activities _____
 e. absorbed by students _____
 f. other (please specify) _____
8. Assuming that you were to attend only one national tournament, which of the following criteria would be important in determining which tournament you would choose? (Please rank the top 5, with "1" identifying the most important.
 a. Proximity of the tournament to my campus
 ___ b. Desirability of the tournament location (historical significance, physical beauty, climate, entertainment, etc.)
 c. Number of my students qualified fund for the tournament.
 d. Ease of attaining funds to attend.
 ___ e. Size of my coaching staff.
 ___ f. Commitment to the philosophy of the tournament.
 g. Length of time required away from campus.
 ___ h. Events offered at the tournament.
 ___ i. Perceived quality of the competition.
 ___ j. Perceived chance of student success.
 k. Perceived quality of tournament management.
 ___ l. Other (please specify): _____

If you could go to any number of national tournaments, which of these criteria would be important in determining how many national tournaments your school would attend? (Please rank the top 5, with "1" identifying the most important.)

- ___ a. Proximity of the tournament to my campus
- ___ b. Desirability of the tournament location (historical significance, physical beauty, climate, entertainment, etc.)
- ___ c. Number of my students qualified fund for the tournament.
- ___ d. Ease of attaining funds to attend.
- ___ e. Size of my coaching staff.
- ___ f. Commitment to the philosophy of the tournament.
- ___ g. Length of time required away from campus.
- ___ h. Events offered at the tournament.
- ___ i. Perceived quality of the competition.
- ___ j. Perceived chance of student success.
- ___ k. Perceived quality of tournament management.
- ___ l. Other (please specify):

10. Indicate to what extent you believe the following statements are accurate descriptions of AFA and NFA national tournaments. The column on the left represents AFA; the one on the right represents NFA. Circle 0 if you have no opinion, 1 if you strongly agree, 2 if you agree, 3 if you are neutral, 4 if you disagree, and 5 if you strongly disagree.

	AFA							NFA					
	NO	S	A	N	D	SD		NO	SA	A	N	D	SD
a.	0	1	2	3	4	5	This tournament is too long.	0	1	2	3	4	5
b.	0	1	2	3	4	5	Tournament administration is excellent.	0	1	2	3	4	5
c.	0	1	2	3	4	5	Quality of competition within sections is unbalanced.	0	1	2	3	4	5
d.	0	1	2	3	4	5	Quality of competition within sections is unbalanced.	0	1	2	3	4	5
e.	0	1	2	3	4	5	Final rounds provide models of excellent forensic performance.	0	1	2	3	4	5
f.	0	1	2	3	4	5	This national tournament emphasizes quality competition.	0	1	2	3	4	5
g.	0	1	2	3	4	5	This national tournament emphasizes broad competition.	0	1	2	3	4	5
h.	0	1	2	3	4	5	Qualification procedures for this tournament are too lenient.	0	1	2	3	4	5
i.	0	1	2	3	4	5	Qualification procedures for this tournament are too stringent.	0	1	2	3	4	5
j.	0	1	2	3	4	5	The events offered are too limited.	0	1	2	3	4	5
k.	0	1	2	3	4	5	I consider this to be "the" national tournament.	0	1	2	3	4	5
l.	0	1	2	3	4	5	The coding of competitors makes it too easy to identify their school affiliation.	0	1	2	3	4	5

	AFA							NFA					
	NO	S	A	N	D	SD		NO	SA	A	N	D	SD
m.	0	1	2	3	4	5	The method for coding competitors is appropriate.	0	1	2	3	4	5
n.	0	1	2	3	4	5	The policy on the number of events a student can do is appropriate.	0	1	2	3	4	5
o.	0	1	2	3	4	5	The number of rounds I am required to judge is excessive.	0	1	2	3	4	5
p.	0	1	2	3	4	5	The judging pool is of high quality.	0	1	2	3	4	5
q.	0	1	2	3	4	5	The scoring system allows for maximum discrimination among contestants.	0	1	2	3	4	5
r.	0	1	2	3	4	5	This tournament is attractive because of its social amenities.	0	1	2	3	4	5
s.	0	1	2	3	4	5	My past experience at this tournament has been pleasant.	0	1	2	3	4	5
t.	0	1	2	3	4	5	My students perceive this tournament to promise them the greatest chance of success.	0	1	2	3	4	5
u.	0	1	2	3	4	5	I like the policy of this tournament in computing sweepstakes points.	0	1	2	3	4	5

11. If AFA-NIET and NFA were to jointly host one national tournament for individual events, how would you feel about it.
- ___ a. Strongly support ___ b. Support ___ c. No opinion
 ___ d. Oppose ___ e. Strongly oppose
12. What would be your reasons for supporting or opposing the joint hosting of a single national individual events tournament?
13. If there were to be a jointly hosted national individual events tournament, what three characteristics would you most want that tournament to have?
14. Do you have any comments in regard to this survey?

SPECIAL TOPICS

SEPARATE AND UNEQUAL: WOMEN IN THE PUBLIC ADDRESS EVENTS

*John M. Murphy**

Over the past fifteen years, the forensics community has sought to understand and eliminate the barriers against women and minorities in the activity. Unfortunately, progress has been slow. In 1974, the First National Developmental Conference issued a call for research that would address these issues (McBath, 1975, p. 23). A full decade later, however, the Second National Developmental Conference made essentially the same request (Parson and Ziegelmueller, 1987, p. 43). In the time since then, several researchers have sought to identify the difficulties facing women in forensics.

This research has used primarily empirical methods to reveal patterns of participation and success by men and women in the activity. Friedley and Manchester (1985) charted relative participation by males and females at national tournaments in 1984. They discovered that males have a strong preference for debate and that individual events tend to be more gender-balanced. A disturbing trend emerged in this research and it was reaffirmed in a later study they conducted (Friedley and Manchester, 1987). They discovered that men have enjoyed a greater level of success in individual events, particularly in the limited preparation events, than women (1987, pp. 11-14).

These studies, as the authors emphasized, have focused exclusively on the important task of revealing the patterns of bias. Although more research certainly needs to be done, it is clear that the imbalance exists and it is important to try to discern the reasons for it. Why do males enjoy a greater amount of success in individual events? How does our activity create that bias? This essay will attempt at least a partial answer to those questions. I argue that, in the public address events, the traditional standards of evaluation favor masculine communication styles. Women are faced with the unpalatable choice of adapting to these norms or of starting a revolution. Such a situation reinforces prejudice against women and their styles of communication, erodes a woman's

**The National Forensic Journal, VII (Fall, 1989), pp. 115-125.*

JOHN M. MURPHY is Assistant Professor of Speech Communication at Bradley University, Peoria, IL 61625.

opportunity to succeed, and reduces the educational value of the activity for all participants. In order to explore these problems, I shall first, examine the traditional standards of rationality that prevail in the public address events; second, contrast those standards with research on the communicative strategies of women; and, finally, discuss the educational implications of this analysis. This essay, then, hopes to spur discussion of the criteria for evaluation in the public address events, urge people to make changes that would allow competitors to explore alternative styles of communication, and make the activity more rewarding for women competitors.

The Rational World Paradigm

For many years, the judging criteria in the public address events have reflected both the norms of society and the standards developed in the field of speech communication for speaking effectiveness. Those norms encompass both traditional standards of rationality such as a deductive, argumentative structure, large amounts of supporting material to prove claims, vocal and physical cues that establish authority, and the establishment of a motivational link, or reasons why the audience should act as the speaker wants. While speakers are often encouraged to use "pathetic appeals," three trends have reinforced what Fisher has termed the "rational world paradigm."

These trends are a natural result of the history of the activity. First, many individual events programs began as an outgrowth of debate and adopted the argumentative perspective that characterizes debate. Second, even as the activity of individual events has matured and moved away from debate, the traditional norms have been supported even more vigorously. This has occurred partly because of the search for academic respectability. As programs seek increased funding and a place in speech communication departments, they have needed to demonstrate that they have as much educational value as debate and possess an equal amount of intellectual rigor. Another reason for this trend results from the inbred nature of the most successful programs. Three of the four coaches at Bradley University have received graduate or undergraduate degrees from Bradley itself, Miami University, Northern Illinois University, and Southern Utah State College. The current director and assistant director of forensics at Eastern Michigan University have studied and graduated from EMU. The individual events directors at Miami University and Illinois State University have both matriculated from Ball State University, another tradi-

tional power. The examples could continue, but the point is clear. Success breeds imitation and these coaches naturally rely upon their past experience; they reinforce the traditional norms of rational argumentation.

Third, the enormous growth in the size of the activity over the past ten to fifteen years has created an irresistible groundswell for uniform judging criteria. Until recently, it could be legitimately contended that few uniform standards existed. That has changed. Students and coaches naturally want to know what the standards of evaluation are at the increasingly larger number and variety of tournaments they attend. Moreover, the growing prestige and size of the NFA and AFA national tournaments have raised the stakes for the people that make the financial commitment to attend them. Schools are spending more money for individual events and programs sell themselves to administrators and recruits by advertising their national success; thus, all participants want clear rules to follow to reduce the possibility that misunderstandings will damage performances and, eventually, the program. Just as important are the growing outlets for publication on the events, such as the *National Forensic Journal*. As a new generation of directors seeks jobs and tenure, they take advantage of the opportunity to publish articles that establish the norms for the events. Those studies become the guidelines for new programs as those coaches attempt to understand the activity and coach their students. Those criteria reflect the rational world paradigm.

It requires only a brief review of various articles on the events to recognize the truth of that assertion. The assumption of an argumentative world view begins with the definition of the activity itself. In 1974, the First National Developmental Conference defined forensics as "an educational activity primarily concerned with using an argumentative perspective in examining problems and communicating with people" (McBath, 1975, p. 11). While the first conference dealt almost solely with debate, the second conference in 1984, with individual events participation, adhered to that definition with only slight modifications. McBath again wrote the rationale for the activity and endorsed his original statement (1984, p. 6). An alternative definition was offered, but it varied little in perspective: "Forensics is a communication-centered experience in scholarship in which one's own ideas and arguments are subjected to the judgment of others" (1984, p. 6). Clearly, the activity itself is defined as an exercise in argument, an endorsement of communication within the rational world paradigm.

Research in the public address events has adopted this perspective with a vengeance. The 1984 Developmental Conference issued a series of general criteria for judging that reflect the argumentative goals of forensics (Murphy, 1984, p. 90). A strictly deductive structure is endorsed along with a statement urging that the speech be organized in a "coherent" manner. Speakers are asked to establish a "motivational link" in their speeches between the topic and the audience. In no way are they expected or urged to reveal their own feelings or connection with the topic. Public address events, from this statement, are to be strictly impersonal exercises in argument.

Those general standards have been reinforced by studies on specific events. Aden and Kay explicitly endorse the definition of forensics as an argument-centered activity when they review the state of questions in extemporaneous speaking (Aden and Kay, 1988). They maintain that the goal of the event is to make a claim and "provide support or 'good reasons' to convince others to accept the claim" (1988, p. 44). In his study of extemporaneous speaking, James Benson (1978) takes a similar perspective. A number of articles on rhetorical criticism or communication analysis have appeared recently and they seem to endorse the rational world paradigm. Murphy, for instance, maintains that the fundamental nature of rhetorical criticism is argument (1988, pp. 3-5). Kay and Aden, while disagreeing with Murphy on a number of points, also accept the rational world paradigm (1989, pp. 38-41).

These two events are usually considered the most strictly logical or rational. The remaining public address events, however, implement the rational world paradigm. In their discussion of impromptu speaking, Reynolds and Fay accept a number of rhetorical strategies, such as the use of personal experience, that seem to lie outside of the norms of argumentation. They also, however, urge speakers to find other tactics to "legitimate" those appeals and they base their discussion of impromptu on the classical canons of rhetoric (1987, p. 87). Allen and Dennis have proposed a series of criteria for informative speaking that emphasize the traditional standards (1989, pp. 53-54). In their hierarchical ballot, research, significance, and organization and support are by far the three most important considerations (1989, p. 54). Even after-dinner speaking has adopted the argumentative perspective. Dreibelbis and Redmond maintain that an ADS is a "humorous-persuasive" speech and that the most appropriate form of organization is problem-solution (1987, p. 97).

Perhaps the most telling evidence of the increasing popularity of logical standards of evaluation comes in a recent study of persuasion. Sellnow and Ziegelmueller (1989) review twenty years of speeches from the Interstate Oratorical Contest. They note that, over the years, the persuasive speech has become a distinctly more logical enterprise. Emotional appeals, personal stories and narratives, and so forth have all declined precipitously. They lament this change and argue that a "persuasive speech should be something more than a well-delivered first affirmative debate speech" (1989, p. 85). Their study, however, reveals clearly that persuasion is moving rapidly in that direction.

While this review has not covered every analysis of public address events, the trends are clear. The rational world paradigm dominates the judging criteria used in individual events. While I believe, as my previous work has shown, that these standards are valuable, such norms alone cannot provide students with the skills they will need in the variety of situations they will encounter. Just as Neo-Aristotelian criticism, as a unitary system, could not help but ignore or denigrate rhetoric that violated the traditional standards, so our current judging criteria punish students who fail to meet them to the detriment of the activity. The limitations of the rational world paradigm become particularly clear when compared to the communicative styles of women.

"Women's Speech: Separate but Unequal?"

Over the past twenty years, gender differences in communication have become an increasingly provocative field of study. Much of the research has been focused on discovering empirically verifiable differences in language use between men and women. Recently, however, that kind of study has come under fire and feminist critics have begun to approach the issue of gender differences from a new perspective. I shall briefly review this research and explain the recent efforts to articulate a "woman's style" (Penelope (Stanley) and Wolf, 1983, p. 125).

Until recently, as the heading of this section drawn from an important essay by Kramer suggests, women's speech has been unfavorably compared to "objective standards" (1974). A long series of language studies have engaged in that kind of research. As Lana Rakow (1986) notes, for instance, Lakoff compares "women's language" with "neutral language" and reveals a series of significant differences. Lakoff argues that women use a different vocabulary, lack aggressiveness, display considerable uncertainty through the use of tag questions and other strategies, and tend toward "hyper-

correct grammar" (Rakow, 1986, p. 15). Rakow joins Spender (1980) in critiquing this approach, claiming that Lakoff characterizes women as "lacking" various qualities and privileges male speech as the norm (Rakow, 1986, p. 16). As Thorne, Kramarae, and Henley note in their review of sex differences research, few of Lakoff's claims, or indeed, situation-invariable gender differences of any sort have emerged (Thorne, Kramarae, and Henley, 1983, pp. 12-14).

Instead, feminist critics in communication, such as Rakow and Kramarae, and in literature, such as Showalter and Kolodny, have begun to argue that the gender differences in communication arise from social contexts, social roles, and power relations (Rakow, 1986, p. 16; Thorne, Kramarae, and Henley, 1983, pp. 11-21). Research has begun to focus on the fact that, as an oppressed group, women have developed alternative styles of communication based upon their subordinate status, their tasks, the division of labor between the sexes, and their talk among themselves (Thorne, Kramarae, and Henley, 1983, pp. 7-21). Scholars have begun to argue that these style are not necessarily lacking the prerequisites for "proper" communication. Instead, they are different strategies that respond to unique circumstances. These studies in communication have been reinforced by the work of feminist literary critics. Showalter notes that the second phase of "feminist criticism was the discovery that women writers had a literature of their own, whose historical and thematic coherence, as well as artistic importance, had been obscured by the patriarchal values that dominate our culture" (1985a, p. 6). While she acknowledges the considerable debate over the nature of the female aesthetic, she stands firm in her claim that feminist criticism can find its "own subject, its own system, its own theory, and its own voice" (1985b, p. 247).

To a large extent, feminist literary critics have begun to find that that voice is rooted in the experiences of women. In her classic essay on feminist criticism, Kolodny (1985) notes that women often create their own symbols and meanings based upon their lives. As she puts it, "the sewing circle rather than the whaling ship, the nursery instead of the lawyer's office" serve as the "functional symbols of the human condition" (Kolodny, 1985, p. 49). Penelope (Stanley) and Wolf argue that a "woman's style" has evolved because women have traditionally been unable to participate in the communication of the society at large: "The women of the twentieth century who write speak out of a tradition of silence, a tradition of closely guarded, personal, revelatory language of dia-

ries and journals" (1983, p. 125). Thus, 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.

Feminists in communication studies have long been engaged in the similar task of finding the voice of women and their conclusions bear a remarkable resemblance to their sisters in literature. Karlyn Campbell (1973) has argued that the social and rhetorical constraints on women have created a particular style of communication she labels "consciousness-raising."² Campbell maintains that women's rhetoric is grounded in personal experience, given that they have been denied the public forum for so long. Often, given the radical nature of their task of overturning the social system, women violate traditional speaking norms in an effort to shatter reality and reveal the contradictions within a woman's role. Campbell also contends that traditional notions of leadership and speaking success cannot account for such rhetoric (1973, pp. 74-86).

Kathleen Jamieson has elaborated on these arguments in her recent analysis of *Eloquence in an Electronic Age* (1988). She distinguishes between a masculine and a feminine style of public speech. Quoting Campbell, Jamieson maintains that feminine rhetoric is "inductive, even circuitous, moving from example to example, and is usually grounded in personal experience. Consistent with their allegedly poetic and emotional natures, women tend to adopt associative, dramatic, and narrative modes of development, as opposed to deductive forms of organization. The tone tends to be personal and somewhat tentative, rather than objective and authoritative" (pp. 75-76). Jamieson argues that societal norms have traditionally opposed this style of speech; the masculine style has dominated public rhetoric and women have adapted accordingly.

That masculine style has also dominated the "Ivory Tower." Treichler and Kramarae have explored the bias against women in classroom settings and they provide more insight into "women's talk as a socio-linguistic subculture" (1983, p. 119). They claim, like Campbell and Jamieson, that women tend to be more concerned with storytelling, with narrative, with personal experience, and with the use of talk to establish equality and maintain relationships, rather than to prove a point. Drawing on sociologists, they maintain that these patterns are established in childhood and tend to carry forward to school experiences; women and men "bring different cultural patterns to interaction" (p. 119).

There exists a growing body of evidence, then, that women's talk differs substantially from the traditional, rational standards of public speech and the criteria developed in forensics. Moreover, the cultural expectations here are very strong. Since the masculine style has historically been privileged, any indication that women do not meet those expectations seems to imply that women are "irrational" or some such. That is not the case. Instead, women have developed alternative communication strategies that do not fit the masculine norms or the rational world paradigm. By elevating that paradigm, we ignore such strategies to the detriment of the activity.

Implications

The use of the rational world paradigm by the forensics world has several important consequences. Most immediately, these traditional standards erode the potential that women have for success. In their important essay on the "rhetoric of confrontation," Scott and Smith note that traditional rhetorical forms reinforce the Establishment (1969, pp. 1-9). The comfortable, conservative nature of the discourse that results from the rational world paradigm gives white males a distinct advantage by privileging their communicative style and preventing legitimate alternative strategies from achieving success.

Moreover, the trends do not bode well for women. As Sellnow and Zeigelmüller argue, persuasion has increasingly resembled a first affirmative speech and, from personal experience, I would contend that the other events are moving in that direction as well. The articles cited that define the events in a rational manner are not old or outdated; to the contrary, most are of quite recent vintage. If anything, the norms that have contributed to a lack of success on the part of women are becoming entrenched.

That situation leaves the woman forensic contestant with two options. She can choose to defy the norms and compete anyway. Some outstanding women will undoubtedly have success, but most, if they rely on the strategies outlined above, will likely be defeated and grow discouraged about the activity. On the other hand, the more popular solution is adaptation. In recent years, particularly in persuasion, women have had outstanding success. Yet I would still maintain that the conspicuous achievement of some women should not be taken as the norm. Jamieson outlines in detail the problems women encounter when they try to adapt. Men who attack their opponents, for instance, are acting in a culturally accepted manner. Women are thought of as overly aggressive bitches. Jamieson also notes that women who "invade the linguistic domain of men

must overcome their own sense of the inadequacies of a woman's speech" (1988, p. 85). In a sense, in order to succeed, women must speak a foreign tongue. And these adaptations also extend to nonverbal attributes. Women are encouraged to speak more slowly, to lower the pitch of their voices, and, in many ways, to appear in the proper suit, imitating a man, in public address. Such changes create distinct discomfort on the part of many women, who are then also told that they need a more "natural" delivery style. Given such circumstances, women are unlikely to reach their potential in the activity.

In fact, few forensics contestants can achieve and learn all that they might under the present system. We recognize that forensics is not the "real world," but we assume that the skills that we teach transfer readily into other contexts. By limiting the students to the rational world paradigm, however, the skills they learn may be inadequate to cope with the situations they face. The kind of argumentative, evidence-filled, authoritative speech required in forensics is not as in demand in the real world.

With the advent of mass media and television, that may be more true than in the past. Jamieson makes a persuasive argument that the feminine style is more suited for television than the masculine style. The intimate nature of the medium encourages self-disclosure and narrative (1988, pp. 82-84). For that matter, the burst of interest in narrative and story-telling as rhetorical strategies or even as a paradigm for human communication, should encourage coaches and participants to take more interest in such traditionally "effeminate" tactics. Certainly, if we wish to teach our students to be effective rhetoricians, we need to end the rule of the rational world paradigm as a unitary system.

Such an assertion is easy to make but very difficult to implement. It would be facile to suggest that these attitudes can be turned around immediately or that rule changes can be enacted that would eradicate the problems. Judges can, however, change their attitudes about "effeminate" tactics. As Sellnow and Zeigelmueller argue, we need to make room for personal experience and narrative strategies. That would at least be a start toward rectifying the current situation. In addition, the overall standards proposed at the 1984 conference need to be modified in practice to allow students to explore alternative rhetorical strategies. For instance, students should be encouraged to use personal experience in events that seem hospitable to such efforts already, such as impromptu, persuasion, and informative. Finally, considerably more research needs to be conducted in this area. This analysis

has limited itself to public address; interpretation should also come under scrutiny. As indicated in the introduction to this paper, some work has been done on the patterns of success and participation by men and women. Yet more work, particularly research aimed at discerning the perceived reasons for the bias, would help the activity.

In short, this brief essay can offer no panacea. It is intended to spark discussion about these problems and begin the process that could lead to change. The difficulties of prejudice in forensics are as deep-rooted as they are in the real world. As Jamieson argues, however, the communication styles in that world have already begun to change. If we truly see forensics as an educational laboratory for understanding, explaining, and testing various rhetorical strategies, we need to expand the range of those tactics beyond the rational world paradigm.

NOTES

¹See, for instance, the special issue of the *National Forensic Journal* on gender and forensics, Spring, 1985.

²"Consciousness-raising" is, of course, a term that has been used to describe the interactions of women in therapy groups. Campbell uses the term in a broader sense to refer to the characteristic rhetoric of the feminist movement.

REFERENCES

- Aden, R.C. and J. Kay. (1988). Improving the educational value of extemporaneous speaking: Refocusing the question. *National Forensic Journal*, VI, 43-50.
- Allen, G. and G. Dennis. (1989). A hierarchical criteria for evaluation in informative, persuasion, and communication analysis. In L. Schnoor and V. Karns, (eds.), *Perspective on individual events: Proceedings of the first developmental conference on individual events*. Mankato, MN: Mankato State University Speech Department, 53-59.
- Benson, J. A. (1978). Extemporaneous speaking: Organization which inheres. *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, 14, 150-155.
- Campbell, K. K. (1973). The rhetoric of women's liberation: An oxymoron. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 59, 74-86.
- Dreibelbis, G. C. and K. Redmond. (1987). But seriously folks...Considerations for writing the competitive after-dinner speech. *National Forensic Journal*, V, 95-104.
- Fisher, W. R. (1987). *Human communication as narration: Toward a philosophy of reason, value, and action*. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press.
- Friedley, S. A. and B. B. Manchester. (1985). An analysis of male/female participation at select national championships. *National Forensic Journal*, III, 1-12.
- Friedley, S. A. and B. B. Manchester. (1987). An examination of male/female judging decisions in individual events. *National Forensic Journal*, V, 11-20.
- Jamieson, K. H. (1988). *Eloquence in an electronic age*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- Kay, J. and R. C. Aden. (1989). Clarifying tournament rhetorical criticism: A proposal for new rules and standards. *National Forensic Journal*, VII, 29-42.
- Kolodny, A. (1985). A map for rereading: Gender and the interpretation of literary texts. In E. Showalter (ed.). *The new feminist criticism*. New York: Pantheon Books, 46-62.
- Kramer, C. (1974). Women's speech: Separate but unequal? *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 60, 14-24.
- McBath, J. (1975). Definitional statement. In J. McBath (ed.), *Forensics as communication*. Skokie, IL: National Textbook Co, 11.
- McBath, J. H. (1984). Toward a rationale for forensics. In D. Parson (ed.), *American forensics in perspective*. Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association, 5-12.
- Murphy, J. M. (1984) Order and diversity: The search for standards in individual events. In D. Parson (Ed.), *American forensics in perspective*. Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association, 87-94.
- Murphy, J. M. (1988). Theory and practice in communication analysis. *National Forensic Journal*, VI, 1-12.
- Penelope (Stanley) J. and S. J. Wolfe. (1983). Consciousness as style: Style as aesthetic. In B. Thorne, C. Kramarae, and N. Henley (eds.), *Language, Gender and Society*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House Publishers, 125-139.
- Rakow, L. (1986) Rethinking gender research in communication. *Journal of Communication*, 36, 11-26.
- Reynolds, C. L. and M. Fay. (1987). Competitive Impromptu Speaking. *National Forensic Journal*, V, 81-94.
- Scott, R. L. and D. K. Smith. (1969). The rhetoric of confrontation. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 55, 1-9.
- Sellnow, T. L. and G. Zeigelmueller. (1988). The persuasive speaking contest: An analysis of twenty years of change. *National Forensic Journal*, VI, 75-88.
- Showalter, E. (1985). The feminist critical revolution. In E. Showalter (ed.), *The new feminist criticism*. New York: Pantheon Books, 3-18.
- Showalter, E. (1985). Feminist criticism in the wilderness. In E. Showalter (ed.). *The new feminist criticism*. New York: Pantheon Books, 243-270.
- Spender, D. (1980). *Man made language*. Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Thorne, B., C. Kramarae, and N. Henley. (1983). Language, gender and society: Opening a second decade of research. In B. Thorne, C. Kramarae, and N. Henley (eds.), *Language, Gender and Society*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House Publishers, Inc., 7-24.
- Treichler, P. A. and C. Kramarae. (1983). Women's talk in the ivory tower. *Communication Quarterly*, 31, 118-132.

PERFORMANCE AND COPYRIGHT: AVOIDING THE PITFALLS

*J. G. Harrington**

Forensics competitions and interpretation festivals are, by their very natures, performance-oriented events. Competitors and festivals participants perform works written by others every week, without the authors' permission. Yet federal law, in essence, grants the exclusive right to perform those works, and the right to license performance, to the authors. This conflict may seem irreconcilable, but the law, as it often does, provides an escape route. This paper examines the potential conflict between copyright law and competitive or festival performance, and suggests two perspectives that would allow performance without violation of copyright law.

I. General Rights of Copyright Holders

The essence of current copyright law is that the holder of a copyright retains all rights in the work. These rights are set out explicitly in the Copyright Act of 1976, which protects a copyright owner's right to reproduce, prepare derivative versions of, distribute, perform publicly and display a work (U.S. Code X 101). Forensic competitions and interpretation festivals fall within this definition.

While it might appear that the combination of exclusive rights to public performance and the broad definition of public performance makes it impossible to perform works at a competition or festival without violating copyright law, that is not the case. The law provides several specific exemptions from copyright liability and, as detailed below, two of these exemptions have the potential to be applied to forensic competition and interpretation festivals. One of the exemptions allows performance of any work, while the other applies to nondramatic works only.

II. Educational Exception

The educational exception permits performances without permission under certain specified circumstances. Like all exceptions under the copyright law, the circumstances are closely circumscribed. However, this exception does have potential application to competitive or festival performances.

**National Forensic Journal*, VII (Fall, 1989), pp. 127-132.

J. G. HARRINGTON is an attorney at law with the firm of Dow, Lohnes, & Albertson in Washington, D.C. 20037.

The relevant portion of the educational exception reads as follows:

. . . performance or display of a work by instructors or pupils in the course of face-to-face teaching activities of a nonprofit educational institution, in a classroom or similar place devoted to instruction (U.S. Code XX110)

While it may not be immediately obvious from the text, this exception can be applied to competitive or festival performance. Moreover, it is applicable to performances of both dramatic and nondramatic literature.

In essence, this exception has four requirements. First, the performance must be by students or teachers. Second, it must be in the course of face-to-face teaching activities. Third, the performance must be related to the activities of a nonprofit educational institution. Finally, it must occur in a place devoted to instruction.

It is clear that forensic competition and interpretation festivals generally meet the first and third criteria. Performances are given by students, and they are almost always related to the activities of nonprofit educational institutions. While it would appear the requirements for face-to-face teaching and performance in a place devoted to instruction are more problematical, there is reason to believe that both criteria can be met by competitive forensics and festival interpretation.

The key to meeting the face-to-face teaching requirement is the purpose of the performance. In general, "performances or displays for entertainment or recreational purposes are not among those protected by the exemption," while use of copyrighted materials "in connection with 'teaching activities' of the institution" is protected (Copyright Law Reports a:xx2125). For instance, a showing of "Casablanca" in a film class could be exempted, but the same film, shown as a fundraiser by a fraternity or even for the Arts School's scholarship fund, would not be. In the case of forensic and festival performances, the primary goal of these performances is educational; while they may entertain, that is not their main purpose. The oft-stated premise that forensics and festival interpretation are intended as co-curricular activities reinforces this perspective on forensic and festival performances. It is important to understand that the statute does not require that a student's regular teacher see and evaluate the performance. In fact, a good argument can be made that performance evaluations by critics add to the educational value of the exercise.

Finally, it is necessary for performances under the educational exemption to take place in a "classroom" environment. The legislative history of this provision helps to shed some light on what it means. According to that history, the term "classroom or similar place devoted to instruction" is not limited to a traditional classroom. It may include any place that might be used in the context of instructing a class, including an auditorium or gymnasium. This relatively broad definition is not limited to events like school assemblies or sports events (House Report 81-86).

The key here is the nature of the likely audience. An assembly or sports event is likely to have an audience that is not being instructed by a teacher. Typically, most of the audience participates for other reasons. The particular nature of forensic competition or interpretation festivals, by contrast, is much more in tune with the demands of the exception. It is not merely that the performances generally take place in classrooms. Much more important is that the typical audience is there, in large part, for instructional purposes, and not merely to be entertained. While this criterion is generally applied to the meetings of particular classes, there is no provision of the statute that forbids extending it to forensic contests or interpretation festivals (Copyright Law Reports, XX 2125).

Overall, there is significant reason to believe that the educational exception for performance could be applied to competitive forensics and festival interpretation. However, competitions or festivals that, for instance, were set up primarily to entertain outside audiences might well have difficulty qualifying for the exemption.

III. *Free and Non-profit Performance Exception*

A second exception to a copyright holder's exclusive rights which may be applied to forensic competition and festival interpretation is the exemption for free and non-profit performances. The scope of this exception is narrower than that of the educational exemption: it covers only "nondramatic" works, rather than all works that may be performed. However, it still may be applicable to performance of prose, poetry and other nondramatic copyrighted works.

The Copyright Act sets out the requirements for this exemption:

. . . the following are not infringements of copyright:

. . . performance of a nondramatic literary or musical work otherwise than in a transmission to the public, without any purpose of direct or indirect commercial advantage and without payment of any

fee or other compensation for the performance to any of its performers, promoters, or organizers, if—

- (A) there is no direct or indirect admission charge; or
- (B) the proceeds, after deducting the reasonable costs of producing the performance, are used exclusively for educational, religious, or charitable purposes and not for private financial gain, except where the copyright owner has served notice of objection to the performance. . . (U.S. Code xx110)

Again, the statute sets out particular criteria. Here, in order to fall within the exemption, a performance must 1) be of a non-dramatic work; 2) not be "transmitted" to the public; 3) be without commercial character or compensation to the performers, promoters or organizers; and 4) either be free to its viewers or have the proceeds from admission used for charitable purposes. These criteria are all fairly straightforward, unlike those for the educational exemption. However, each should be examined in turn.

First, the work must be nondramatic. This means that drama and its musical correlative, opera, are excluded from the exemption. However, prose, poetry and other nondramatic forms may be performed under this exemption.

Second, the performance must not be transmitted. Transmission occurs when a performance is communicated "by any device or process whereby images or sounds are received beyond the place from which they are sent" (U.S. Code xx101). The legislative history makes it clear that the purpose of this requirement is to assure that "the exemption would be limited to public performances given directly in the presence of an audience" (House Report). In this context, it is clear that performances at interpretation festivals and forensic competitions do not constitute "transmissions," and that this second prong of the test is satisfied.*

The first part of the third prong of this test is summarized in the House Report as "no profit motive," and that is an accurate description. While it is true that many forensic competitions and interpretation festivals do earn profits, that does not destroy their noncommercial nature. It is the overall nature of the enterprise involved that matters. For instance, a free performance of excerpts from a novel, sponsored by General Motors for the purpose of

**This exemption would not apply if performances were videotaped for later showing (Columbia Pictures). The law does not, however, preclude taping of predominantly original works that make "fair use" of other, copyrighted works. Thus, videotapes of persuasive or extemporaneous speeches would be unlikely to infringe copyrights held by individuals or publications quoted in the speeches.*

promoting a new car, would not be eligible for this exemption. A performance of the same novel sponsored by a scholarship fund could meet the requirements, even if admission were charged. Since the purpose of organizations sponsoring interpretation festivals and forensic competitions is non-commercial, this element of the third prong is satisfied.

The other key element of the third prong of this exception is that the performers, directors and organizers must not receive compensation for the performance. Simply put, compensation for the performance is not an issue so long as cash prizes for participants are not involved in the competition or festival. Even then, it would be arguable that there is no compensation for the mere performance of a work, although this would be more difficult to demonstrate.

Finally, the performance must either be free to its viewers or the proceeds from admission charges must be used for charitable purposes. Typically, this is not likely to be a problem, since admission is not generally charged to audience members at forensic competitions. Even if entry fees were considered to be admission charges, they would not invalidate the exception unless the net proceeds from the contest or festival were used for the individual profit of the organizer. Since most contests or festivals are sponsored by nonprofit organizations like colleges and universities, this is not a likely result. It should be noted that, if admission is charged, the copyright holder has the right to forbid the performance, provided that seven days' notice is given to the performer (U.S. Code xx110). However, it is unlikely that any copyright holder would have the opportunity to object prior to a competition or festival, given the difficulty of ascertaining what will be performed in advance.

Once again, it appears that the "non-profit" exemption would apply to both forensic competition and interpretation festivals. However, given the limited scope of this exception to the Copyright Act, it is not as useful as the educational exemption discussed above.

IV. Conclusion

While the Copyright Act of 1976 broadened the rights of copyright holders, there are exceptions to its provisions that permit performance without infringement of copyrights. Two of these exceptions, one covering all works and one for non-dramatic works only, can be applied to forensic competition and festival interpretation in order to demonstrate that performances at these

events are within the parameters permitted by the terms of the Copyright Act.

There are, however, important limitations to these conclusions. First, the exceptions in the Copyright Act only apply to works copyrighted under United States law. Foreign works are governed by the Berne Convention, and performance may not be permitted, depending upon the law of the copyrighting country. Second, performance rights are only one aspect of an author's rights under the Act. Authors have the right to prevent alterations to their works, although it is unclear to what extent the kind of editing normally permitted under competition rules would violate those rights. Nevertheless, the exceptions to authors' rights under the Copyright Act of 1976 discussed here do provide an important measure of protection for performance of copyrighted works in forensic competition and at interpretation festivals.

REFERENCES

- Columbia Pictures Industries, Inc. v. Redd Home, Inc., 749 F.2d 154 (3d Cir. 1984) ("Columbia Pictures").
Copyright Law Reports, Washington: Commerce Clearing House (1988).
House of Representatives Report No. 94-1476, 94th Congress, 2d Session (1976) ("House Report").
17 United States Code xxx101-110 (1981 Suppl.) ("U.S. Code").

INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICES

ADDRESSING THE NEEDS OF ACADEMICALLY TALENTED STUDENTS: A FORENSICS MODEL FOR THE BASIC PUBLIC SPEAKING COURSE

*Kevin W. Dean and David G. Levasseur**

College communities, like any microcosm, are populated by a vast diversity of students with a wide range of needs and interests. Unfortunately, despite our best intentions, the educational needs of many of our most talented students go unmet. The impact of such oversights has been felt in numerous ways. A 1983 report by The National Science Foundation found that, "the total number of highly superior students who drop out at one stage or another totals over 125,000 a year. It is particularly pertinent that the greatest loss occurs not in the transition from high school to college, but after college entrance." The report went on to claim that, "a formalized honors program offers one viable solution to this high attrition rate among talented students."¹

Recent years have produced an increasing awareness on the part of administrators and educators to fill a pedagogical void by offering courses targeted towards a previously neglected group: academically talented students. Often such courses are housed in "honors programs" and have been found to "challenge faculty, raise academic standards across the board, and generally invigorate an educational institution."²

Our failure to offer academic stimulation to our talented students is often apparent in departments of speech communication, particularly within the basic course. One writer notes, "It is almost axiomatic that the larger and more heterogeneous the student population, the greater the need for an honors program to ensure that the more able student does not lose his or her enthusiasm early on."³ Inevitably, communication educators find themselves dealing with students performing on a diversity of skill levels within the basic course. Varied skill levels are especially obvious in basic public speaking courses where some students, due to high school

**The National Forensic Journal*, VII (Fall, 1989), pp. 133-142.

KEVIN W. DEAN is the Basic Course Director and Coordinator of Forensics Activities in Speech Communication at the University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20724; DAVID G. LEVASSEUR is a Master's Candidate and Assistant Coordinator of Forensics Activities in Speech Communication at the University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742.

experience, forensics work, or simply innate talent, demonstrate clear mastery of basic organizational, research, writing and oral performance skills that keep others floundering. Our field justifiably offers attention to individuals who are communication-apprehensive, yet seems reticent to offer innovations for the academically talented.

The problem is magnified at our institution by the current design of our basic course. Although our basic course services nearly seven hundred students per term, we offer no curricular, co-curricular or extra-curricular mechanism which allows gifted students the challenge to refine these previously developed skills. We presently have no official forensics program, a natural draw for such students. The advanced public speaking course requires the basic course as a prerequisite and, due to limited resources, has become an exclusive opportunity for communication majors. Furthermore, while our institution does have an honors program that serves over one thousand students, there are currently no honors course offerings in speech communication that run concurrently with our standard course offerings. One way the communication discipline can challenge our talented students through academic curriculum and programs is through "honors" sections of the basic course.

Offering a voluntary accelerated program under the rubric of our basic public speaking course at the University of Maryland became our goal. Our motivation for the project was two-fold. First, while we did not wish to withdraw all skilled students from the basic course, we did want to provide an experimental opportunity for those motivated for an extra challenge.⁴ Second, we hoped that the project might be an initial step towards instituting a viable forensics program which was truly co-curricular. Thus, to meet these needs, we established an experimental "accelerated program" in conjunction with the basic public speaking course during the fall term of 1988. Using a forensics model, the special section offered students increased individual instruction in crafting oral presentations at a higher level of sophistication than expected in the traditional basic course.

Our experiment met with mixed results. In this paper we will outline the procedure we followed in setting up the project, some pitfalls we experienced, and some suggestions for future endeavors.

Establishing the Advanced Section

Frequently, honors courses evolve from an institution's standard curriculum, and parallel the material presented to the tradi-

tional student. One report notes that, "honors program courses differ from other courses because of additional reading and writing assignments, more independent study, more in-depth discussion, and critical thinking exercises."⁵ Another study claims the uniqueness of honors courses is in providing students "with more opportunities for creative thought and discussion as well as research and questioning. . . . Students are asked to read more primary source materials, cover the subject area in greater depth, and write more papers."⁶ Adhering to these precepts of honors courses, we began to plan our special section.

The basic public speaking course at the University of Maryland yields three credits and requires students to attend a mass lecture twice a week and lab sections once per week. In the lab sections, students present three major (five- to ten-minute duration) graded presentations over the course of the semester. Recognizing that students in the "advanced" section would receive credit for the basic course in public speaking, we first needed to make certain that students would meet at least these minimum standards.

A room was scheduled for two hours on Monday and one hour on Wednesday afternoon at a time which did not conflict with the mass lecture. Special section students were exempted from the mass lecture, except on special occasions of specific lectures or speakers, and their previously assigned lab was replaced by the special Monday-Wednesday lab section. They were assigned three major speeches of "forensics nature." This meant that the presentations (informative, persuasion, after-dinner, rhetorical criticism) would be eight to ten minutes in duration and would be expected to reach a level of perfection (organization, research, delivery, etc.) suitable to the novice level of regional individual events competition. All basic course students included in the advanced section were also required to take a written final examination; but in the advanced section the format was essay rather than objective.

Studies of honors programs appear uniform in their claims that full value is obtained with "extra-course" and/or "capstone" projects which supplement in-class activities.⁷ Indeed, "social events, enrichment activities, and recognition festivities are essential elements to honors programs."⁸ Grounding the special section in a forensics model made the selection of our capstone project obvious-participation in a tournament. Thus, an additional feature of the course was providing those students who wanted the experience a chance to enter an end-of-the-term regional forensics tournament hosted by a nearby university. This tournament was particularly well-suited for our needs, for it fell at the end of our

term, and it offered novice events. Assuming that all the students would want to participate in the tournament and being hesitant to mandate participation, we presented the tournament to students as a strongly-encouraged option.

With the format in place, we next needed to obtain the students. Since the advanced section was experimental, we arbitrarily decided that we would work with eight to twelve students. This move was consistent with the philosophy of honors programs to limit student enrollment and maintain small class size.⁹ We opted to place no initial restrictions (e.g., previous course work, forensics experience, grade point of "x," senior standing, etc.) on those who would inquire. Instead, we compiled a detailed questionnaire that would help us assess the background and potential commitment of the students. Ultimately, we looked for students we felt were earnestly interested in the project. Our only specific criteria, in addition to desire for more advanced experience, was a desire to participate in forensics competition. Since the capstone forensics tournament was such an affordable option, we reasoned that this event would function as a nice bonding and motivational element for the class members. Those clearly not interested in such an experience might not be best served by the direction we were taking.

To assess the interest level and commitment of the students, we scheduled fifteen-minute interviews over a ten-day period. On the first day of mass lecture we made a presentation explaining the special section. We emphasized the rigor of the course and made it blatantly clear that expectations would be high. Forty students went through the interview process, and from those we selected ten. Selections were made by the start of the third week of class, so that our experiment could begin. The group selected was quite diverse: three men and seven women, freshman through seniors, grade point averages ranging from 2.6 to 3.9, and ethnic diversity. The common link was an apparent drive to achieve in an accelerated program in public speaking.

Assessment

The project enjoyed moderate success. We were able to cover, in much greater depth than was possible in the traditional basic course, the theoretical components which serve as a foundation for public speaking. Students were exposed to sophisticated research techniques, including an introduction to the journals of our discipline. Through the course they received more guidance and prodding to increase the quality of their writing and presentational skills

than did students in the regular course. The capstone experience at the forensics tournament was meaningful for the students who opted to participate. Indeed, it was perhaps the best motivational aspect of the course. We observed a marked increase in student effort and enthusiasm in the two weeks leading to this event. Of the ten students in the class, six went to the extra-curricular event and captured eight awards, including first prizes in the novice divisions of informative and persuasive speaking.

At the same time, however, our course design led to some significant pitfalls. Our first difficulty, insufficient time for topic selection, is inherent within the forensics model itself. While specific topic selection for various assignments is often not a significant variable in the evaluation of the final product in traditional classes, in the forensics model careful topic selection is critical. While it may be an arguable weakness of forensics, most coaches acknowledge that certain topics (e.g., a persuasion speech on drunk driving, abortion, or capital punishment) have become taboo in competition due to overexposure. Understandably, once students were duly warned, most of them opted to select a different subject, even though it meant many additional library hours. Thus, topic selection impeded the pace of the course.

The problem was magnified when several students perceived no need to adhere to a presentation timetable. They knew they were expected to have three ten-minute presentations by the end of the term, but procrastination soon set in. While all the students worked on projects, finalized drafts were long in coming. Students who had no specific material to work with lost valuable time that could have been spent honing specific writing and presentational strategies. These subjects, for students who had not selected viable topics, could only be discussed in the abstract.

The next problem, low student commitment, stemmed from our hesitancy to establish a formal classroom environment, which would have been the norm for traditional sections of the basic course. Convinced by the overwhelming enthusiasm from the students who interviewed and were selected for the course, and reinforced by the honors program literature which encourages program flexibility,¹⁰ we began by fostering the more personable role relationship of coach/student rather than the more traditionally formal rule of teacher/student. We further encouraged a "work-at-your-own-pace" attitude, where we would serve as mentors rather than task masters. This tone caused some students to view the experience in a non-academic light.

One symptom of this non-academic view was poor class attendance. Believing that sheer dedication would keep the students coming, we did not mandate class attendance. As weeks progressed, students offered an ever-increasing number of excuses for missed hours, and the initial commitment seemed to wane. At one point, a student asked permission to miss our scheduled time so she could "do work for real classes."

The stress with the attendance issue was heightened by our willingness to accept students into the course who had scheduling problems. Two of the students who appeared most earnest had class conflicts with one of the course's three scheduled hours. Since a large portion of the class was devoted to individual work, we were willing to set up additional hours with these students to meet the three-hour weekly commitment. Their absence from the group became obvious. This hampered the group's potential for cohesion and fostered the assumption that attendance was not essential.

We would offer two possibilities which partially explain this behavior signifying lack of commitment. First, many students, ours being no exception, are inundated with activities from early September. Keeping student momentum alive for an event not scheduled until December is not an easy task. Second, as Todd notes, the personality types of individuals often drawn to honors classes (tendencies toward introversion and intuition-dominant measures on the Myers-Briggs Personality Type Indicator) tend not to actively seek assistance when problems are encountered. Such individuals perform better in a more structured environment.¹¹

Our third problem-spot stemmed from our selection process. While research on honors programs consistently maintains that no single measure (e.g., SAT score, grade point average [GPA], etc.) is a determining factor for admission to an honors course, the assumption is clear that some minimum standard of verifiable academic performance needs to be presented.¹² While we requested students to provide us with their GPAs, this did not become a significant criterion in our evaluation and ultimate decision for class membership. In our selection process, perceptions of earnest student commitment and a record of prior speech experience weighed more heavily than other factors.

Despite commitment and prior experience, intellectual ability soon became a discriminating factor. Several of the students simply did not have the fundamental writing or research skills to keep up with the rest of the group and, as a result, became frustrated. By

the end of the project, we observed that irrespective of prior experience, those who gained most from the class (based on our evaluation of individual progress and their evaluation of the course) were the students with higher grade point averages. The other students would have benefited more had they remained in the traditional course where basic elements of writing and organization were given more direct attention.

We do want to clarify that GPA by itself should not be the determining factor. Our extensive work with forensics programs has shown that there is not always a correlation between scholastic aptitude and oral performance. Many students who do not necessarily test well can excel in arenas which measure effectiveness through oral communication. However, GPA is one measure of dedication to academic pursuits. Certainly the demands of such a course as the one outlined here mandate such commitment.

Recommendations

While we were particularly pleased with the results of our capstone project, and while student evaluations of their experiences were generally positive, the quality of the overall course from our vantage as educator/coaches was less than we had hoped. Given our experiences from this venture, we make eight recommendations to others interested to providing such a course:

1. Require deadline dates for all assignments. This would hopefully keep the coursework progressing along and place more of an academic priority on the class. Further, it would allow time for more extensive re-writes, which would be likely to increase the quality of the speeches.
2. Require strict attendance for the course.
3. Restrict class membership to those who can attend all group sessions.
4. Provide time early in the course to work on presentational skills through declamation or oral interpretation activities and exercises. Students must be confident with a body of material and not concerned with memorization, if coaching of presentational elements is to be worthwhile. Students with specific assignments (e.g., a four-minute poetry reading or four memorized minutes of a famous or student oration) would be more likely to comprehend and be able to apply these presentational skills to later work.
5. De-emphasize the capstone, end-of-the-term, tournament and attempt to get students to a forensics event earlier in the season. Our coaching experience with established forensics programs has taught us the value of getting students out early to tourna-

ments. Tournaments motivate efforts for preparation and, if nothing else, would force students to select topics early. Furthermore, assuming the experience is a positive one, tournaments are wonderful vehicles for building enthusiasm.

6. If using an end-of-the-term tournament as a capstone event, it should be co-curricular rather than extra-curricular, and thus required of all students. While provisions must exist for emergencies, and while grades should be based on tournament preparation and not performance outcome, a tournament provides a unique educational experience to which students in such a course should have exposure.

7. Require a writing sample during the interview process. This would help to measure the ability levels of the students more accurately.

8. Recognizing that most honors programs have a GPA of 3.5 (on a 4.0 scale) as a cut-off point for admission to honors courses, consider very carefully before registering individuals for the "forensics section" who do not have at least a 3.0.

Conclusions

Offering a co-curricular "honors" experience through the basic public speaking course for more experienced speakers and/or those desiring an accelerated format can be very rewarding for students as well as instructors. A course such as the one outlined here fills a current void in our curriculum which desperately needs our attention.

In preparing to offer such a program we would recommend the acknowledging of forensics limitations, the stringent application of the above guidelines, and a selection process that does not solely rest on GPA, but takes prior academic experience into careful consideration. We hope to have learned from our mistakes and look forward to an opportunity to revise our approach to address the advanced basic course student.

NOTES

¹William E. Piland, Patricia McKeague, and Warren Montgomery, "Serving Academically Gifted Students in Community Colleges," *The College Board Review* 143 (Spring 1987), 21.

²"A Sampling of Exemplary Honors Programs," *Administrator* (January 30, 1984), 2.

³Richard J. Cummings, "Exploring Values, Issues, and Controversies," eds. Paul G. Friedman and Reva C. Jenkins-Friedman, in *Fostering Academic Excellence Through Honors Programs* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1986), 19.

⁴A frequent hesitation in offering honors sections has been the charge that all the "good" students will be drawn out of the course, leaving a mass of mediocrity. Honors program research shows this to be a fallacy. One report

offers consolation to faculty who fear a "brain drain" from their regular sections, noting, "all academically talented students will not opt for participation in honors for various reasons: time, scheduling, or perceived rigor of honors work." (See Susan M. Todd, "Scholars and Strategies: Honors Programs in Community Colleges, Part I," *Community College Review* 16 [1988], 21.) Another study claimed that, "the press of time surfaces as a disadvantage of honors program participation for many students, along with high faculty expectations and self-expectations." (See: William E. Piland and Janet Azbell, "The Honors Program Student: A Typical Profile," *Community and Junior College Journal* 58 [1984], 47.)

⁵Piland, McKeague and Montgomery, 34.

⁶Jack Friedlander, "Honors Programs," *Community and Junior College Journal* (February, 1983), 27.

⁷Friedlander, 27-28.

⁸See: C. Grey Auston, "Orientation to Honors Education," eds. Paul G. Friedman and Reva C. Jenkins-Friedman, in *Fostering Academic Excellence Through Honors Programs* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1986), 15 and Todd, 24.

⁹Piland, McKeague, and Montgomery, 34.

¹⁰See: Austin, 10; Friedlander, 28; and Todd, 22.

¹¹Todd, 21, grounding her claims in a 1986-87 study by Wittig, Schurr and Ruble (*Forum for Honors*, 17, 26-35), argues that a "system which is too vague and outlines which allow too much flexibility may be misleading, confusing and frustrating, introverted and intuitive than the general populations."

¹²See: Reva C. Jenkins-Friedman, "Identifying Honors Students," eds. Paul G. Friedman and Reva C. Jenkins-Friedman, in *Fostering Academic Excellence Through Honors Programs* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1986), 29-39; Piland, McKeague, and Montgomery, 35; and Friedlander, 27.

REVIEW

OF PROFESSIONAL RESOURCES

JACK KAY, EDITOR

Prima Facie: A Guide to Value Debate, ed. by Stephen Wood and John Midgley. Dubuque, IA: Kendall Hunt Publishing Company, 1986.

From the beginning of the Cross Examination Debate Association in the 1970s much debate has occurred regarding appropriate practices and procedures for value debate. *Prima Facie: A Guide to Value Debate* is championed as the first text to address specifically the type of debate envisioned by the founders of CEDA. The book is divided into three parts: introduction to value debate, getting ready to debate, and final preparations.

Several features of this work deserve special attention. The writers do an excellent job of providing a concise history of debate, in general. More specifically, substantial room is devoted to the history and development of CEDA debate and its distinction from other debate organizations. Part One makes clear that the writers view CEDA debate as a successful alternative to other forms of debate.

The first strength of this text is achieved by segments in which writers are engaged in brief discussions about how to approach types of propositions (see Lawson, Brownlee, and Gill) that may be used. While much debate has occurred over whether CEDA topics have been fact or value resolutions, these authors posit that fact and value resolutions may be jointly referred to as propositions of judgment. Thus, in accepting propositions of judgment as encompassing a debate over the belief or worth of ideas, the distinction between fact and value need not be considered.

Another particularly useful feature of this text is in Cantrill's work identifying debate strategies. He does an excellent job of succinctly identifying the leading strategic concerns of CEDA debate (rule usage, cue control, and impression management). In this identification, the reader is not persuaded to accept or reject strategies but is informed of the current debate over these strategies and how debaters may successfully use and counter the strategies.

A third noteworthy strength is in the treatment of delivery issues. While CEDA has championed itself as the antithesis of poor delivery techniques of other forms of competitive debate, this work offers specific discussion of those practices considered unfavorable (see Pelham and Watt and Lewis and Vartabedian) and identifies practices which are considered to be good stylistic choices by the authors.

Related to stylistic concerns is Giuliano's treatment of audience analysis. Early in CEDA's development, discussion was frequently offered suggesting that audience analysis prior to the debate round should not be necessary. To include a chapter specifically addressing audience analysis gives this variable the importance that it deserves. Giuliano suggests that as much information as possible about any judge-critic should be sought out and used.

While this text offers unique treatment for CEDA debate, it is not without its problems. This work has a stylistic problem. As with many other multi-authored works, this book features a number of different writing styles. Some chapters are particularly oral in style, while others are rather formally written. As a result, the text does not flow well but appears to jump from topic to topic.

Second, the overall focus of the text does not remain consistent. For example, the initial treatment of the history of CEDA sets forth the notion that CEDA is value debate. A number of chapters, however, suggest that the propositions that have been used are not value propositions as much as quasi-policy or judgment propositions. Assuming, as this work suggests, that this text is intended for students learning debate, confusion is likely to occur over the distinctions among the terms used.

A final difficulty for this reviewer rests with some of the language chosen for discussing the distinctions of CEDA debate and its stylistic choices from other forms of debate. The National Debate Tournament (NDT) form of debate may be seen as characterized in a negative light. Initially, the reader apparently is presented with the necessity of making a choice between one or the other. Although I do not believe that this is the intent of the editors, depending on how one reads those statements, greater divisiveness may be created than is necessary.

Despite its shortcomings, this work offers useful insight into the thinking behind CEDA and preparing debaters to adopt to this

form of debate. Cantrill's strategic considerations are a must for any CEDA team.

Mary M. Gill
University of Nebraska-Lincoln

Debate Tournament Administrator, computer program for tournament scheduling (IBM-based), by Stephen Wood and Joseph Miller, 1988, 1990.

The 1980s have witnessed the dawn of an era in which computers have become a mainstay in much of organizational life. In concert with these advances, the forensics community has endeavored to utilize computer technology. Specifically, several programs have been developed to administer forensics tournaments. One of the latest programs to be released is the *Debate Tournament Administrator* (DTA), created by Dr. Stephen C. Wood and Joseph B. Miller.

Two versions of DTA were analyzed for this review, version 1.1 which was released in 1988 and version 1.2 which will be released in 1990. To review this program, a mock six-round tournament was set up, with four teams entered. The minimum number of rounds and participants was used for the sake of efficiency; a larger tournament would not provide any additional data. The following review will consist of a description and review of each section, or option, of the DTA program.

Enter Tournament Information

After gaining access to the system, the first option available to the tournament director is the entry of tournament information. Once that option has been accessed, the director has several additional choices. First, he or she may determine tournament parameters, such as the tournament name, date, and host, as well as division names and number of preliminary rounds. Then, the director may enter, add, or delete teams, judges, and rooms. Finally, there is an option to edit team information for last-minute team or name changes.

In general, this option is easy to follow and execute. We found several problems with the program, however. First, the DTA manual suggests that the director make two copies of the program after entering team names so that if teams drop during registration,

DTA can easily re-pair round one. We find this to be an excellent suggestion, but it does not account for later drops. Thus, if a team becomes ill during the tournament, it is very difficult to drop the team from the program; the director must manually swap pairings to take the drop into account. Second, the room list does not allow the director to specify when rooms are open or closed. Therefore, if classroom space changes throughout the tournament, the director must make those changes by utilizing the "change rooms" option of the menu. We did like a provision on version 1.2 which allows rooms to vary by division, but there is still no way to make room changes except by hand.

Round Information

This section of the program allows the director to enter results, and to review and print round information. Entering results is easy with DTA, perhaps too easy. For example, if the affirmative team wins, the director only needs to hit "return." If the negative team wins, the program indicates that the director needs to hit an "N." However, we found that a negative win was recorded if any key were pressed, so that an affirmative win could accidentally be recorded as a negative win if the ";" key were hit. In the rushed atmosphere of a tournament it would be easy to make such an error. Both versions allow the director to abort an entry. While this is a great check, it creates some unique problems to change a decision later in the tournament. The review and printing of round information is useful. The DTA manual urges the reader to print round information after each round, and we agreed that this is essential. The final results sheet also is an excellent plus in using this program.

Random Match

The random matching option is also simple to utilize. The programmers have made some initial assumptions about random matching. First, all teams from the same school are placed on the same side of the bracket. Second, if a director chooses to split teams from the same school so that some debate affirmative and some debate negative, they could meet each other, creating many potential problems. Finally, the director cannot reschedule round two after round one is set, further emphasizing the need for a second copy of the tournament information so that rounds can be rescheduled.

The judging assignments work in an interesting way in the DTA program. For example, if the director chooses to change a judge assignment, the program apparently overrides any school or scheduling conflicts that were previously recorded. Thus, the director must be satisfied with the assignments, or be extremely careful when re-doing the assignments by hand. Also, judges are assigned based on the first available judge on the list. It has been our experience that we like to vary the judge pool from round to round, so this method in our opinion is unsatisfactory. One helpful aspect of the program is a judge matrix which allows the director to see the judging assignments and constraints by team and by individual judge. The matrix, however, does not override the more pressing judging concerns.

Power Match

The DTA program allows the director to power match or power protect rounds, with or without side constraints. For either type of powering, DTA does not (according to the Manual) prevent teams from meeting teams previously debated in randomly matched rounds. The director must therefore carefully check all pairings and swap teams to avoid this occurrence. Additionally, if a team must hit an opponent more than once, the program makes no effort to switch sides. In our tournament, teams obviously had to meet opponents more than once, but in all except one case, the teams did not switch sides. A final concern is that once the pairings have been set, the computer will print the schedule on top to bottom order, again requiring the director to manipulate the pairings.

The power protect option is one that is rarely used on the college circuit. Instead, usually in even-numbered rounds, teams are paired high-low *within brackets*. The DTA program does not allow for that option; it pairs the best team against the worst team, and so forth. Therefore, if the director chooses the more conventional method, the rounds must be paired manually and then later added to the computer. Otherwise, the director must settle for an option which is generally unacceptable to most college coaches, or must power all rounds high-high.

Elimination Round Pairings

The elimination round pairings option selects the teams which should advance in the tournament. Version 1.1 of the program actually paired the first elimination round, an option which could

be quite useful; version 1.2 eliminated this option and simply lists, in rank order, the top teams. This method allows the director to eliminate teams that cannot advance (i.e., teams from the host school). We generally react favorably to this change, although we would like to have seen the pairing option continued. Our tests of version 1.1 indicated that if teams tied on win/loss record and points, that high and low *individual* speaker points were dropped to break the tie. Again, this practice veers from tradition in which high and low *team* points typically are dropped to break ties for elimination ranks. We were unable to manipulate the data in version 1.2 to determine if the same phenomenon occurred.

The final element of the program which does not work well for elimination rounds is that only one judge is assigned to each round. The programmers suggest that the director re-pair each round three times to get three judges, but this seems terribly cumbersome.

Speaker Awards

Speaker awards can be tabulated by DTA as well. In our test, version 1.1 tabulated awards based solely on round one. Version 1.2 did compile results from all six rounds. In this program, ties were broken based on dropping high and low points only once, then going to ranks. While we do not see much difficulty with this system, traditionally in cases of ties, high and low points are dropped until they cannot be dropped further, and then ranks are considered.

Final Options

The final options offered by DTA are necessary and helpful. One option allows the director to retrieve information from the disk after the computer has been turned off for the day. Another option provides a method for backing up data files, which the authors strongly suggest performing frequently.

Conclusions

We found that DTA is relatively user-friendly. The Manual is easy to read, although there were several typographical errors in the text. The program itself is easy to follow as well, even without the use of the Manual. If an error is made, the program is usually quite specific about the nature of the error. Finally, the consumer

support for this program is excellent; we received prompt and courteous attention when we utilized this service.

Despite these advantageous, we would not use this program in an actual tournament. The authors emphasize through the Manual that back-up cards and manual checking is necessary. Thus, using the program could simply consume additional time. In addition, there are nonconventional aspects of the program which we do not feel comfortable utilizing in a typical college tournament. In fact, in the case of power protection and elimination ranking based on dropped high and low individual points, we are opposed to the method utilized by the program. Therefore, our objections are based upon the nature and philosophy of the program, not simply on the minor "glitches" that occurred in our small sample.

While computers may be useful in most organizational settings, in this case the computer still cannot handle all of the constraints imposed by a typical tournament. Thus, while the rest of society benefits from technological advances, we strongly recommend the tried and true method of tournament tabulation—using cards, pencils and paper.

Ann Burnett Pettus
Jim Dittus
University of Nebraska-Lincoln

*The authors would like to thank Karla Wiseman for her assistance in studying DTA.

EDITORS FORUM: A Defense of Questions in Rhetorical Criticism

*David G. Levasseur and Kevin W. Dean**

At the Student Assembly of the 1989 Individual Events Nationals, Representative Cam Jones, a Cornell University senior, led a discussion of the issue of questions in rhetorical criticism. Jones prefaced this discussion with an interesting analogy. Student deliberations on this topic, Jones claimed, were akin to 1968 Czechoslovakian deliberations on whether or not the Soviet tanks should decimate their national rebellion. The Czechoslovakians could deliberate at length, but the tanks would come anyway.¹ Ultimately, the tanks did come; at the 1989 NFA tournament, the coaches voted to end questions in rhetorical criticism. While we do not agree with the extent of Jones' metaphor, we do feel it accurately reflects student sentiments. Jones' metaphor failed, we hope, because unlike the Soviet Politburo, the coaches' ultimate motive was the education of forensic competitors. In addition, we hope Jones' analogy fails, for unlike the Czechoslovakian massacre, the decision to eliminate the questioning period can be reversed.

The forensic community should continue its debate on questions in rhetorical criticism. We suggest that ending this questioning period was inconsistent with the goals of both forensics and the event of rhetorical criticism. Any forensic activity which helps fulfill a forensic goal without any deleterious consequences should be maintained. Consequently, we will endeavor to answer two important questions: (1) Do questions in rhetorical criticism help satisfy a forensic objective? and (2) If so, are there any valid arguments against maintaining the questioning period?

This first question necessitates a review of forensic objectives. Forensics is commonly justified as a co-curricular activity which extends classroom theory and practice.² The Second National Conference on Forensics affirmed this justification by adopting a

**The National Forensic Journal, VII (Fall, 1989), pp. 151-158.*

DAVID G. LEVASSEUR is a Masters Candidate and Assistant Coordinator of Forensics Activities in Speech Communication at the University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742; KEVIN W. DEAN is the Basic Course Director and Coordinator of Forensics Activities in Speech Communication at the University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742. Both authors were national finalists in Rhetorical Criticism at the NFA's I.E. Nationals in 1988 and 1981 respectively.

rational statement which said, in part, "Forensics remains an ongoing, scholarly experience, uniting students and teachers in its basic educational purpose."³ The conference report went on to recommend measures for strengthening the educational goals of forensics. Specifically, the report recommended that forensics should foster "students' ability to adapt to various communication contexts."⁴ This recommendation encourages events which offer competitors a unique rhetorical setting. In addition, the conference suggested that forensics is "an expression of scholarship," and forensics activities are "laboratories within which the results of student scholarship are evaluated."⁵ These statements seem to encourage forensic activities which promote superior student scholarship. Questions in rhetorical criticism help satisfy these educational goals of forensics; they subject students to a unique communicative environment, and they produce superior rhetorical scholarship.

Several individuals at the coaches' meeting argued that questions in rhetorical criticism merely foster skills already tested in limited preparation events. These advocates fail to realize that there is a considerable difference between having two to thirty minutes to prepare a speech in response to a written question and having two to five seconds to formulate a cogent answer in response to a direct oral question. This latter form of question-answering skills is exceedingly important in our society. A plethora of textbooks on business presentations include separate sections on answering questions.⁶ Our national laws are ultimately interpreted by nine justices who persistently pepper attorneys with questions during oral arguments.⁷ Politicians rise to and maintain prominence through interviews, press conferences, and debates.⁸ In all of these instances, respondents cannot utilize two to thirty minutes to formulate their answers. In these settings, respondents cannot answer with a multi-part speech. The Second National Conference on Forensics advocated alternative tournament events which would train students for "business communication," "legal argument," and "political settings."⁹ Questions in rhetorical criticism already help advance student skills in each of these rhetorical contexts; thus, these questions partially satisfy a forensic educational priority.

Questions in this event also fulfill a second educational purpose: they encourage more knowledgeable rhetorical critics. Campbell claims that success in scholarly rhetorical criticism is positively related to the critic's exposure to rhetorical acts, critical

analyses, theories, and studies.¹⁰ Rhetorical scholars also argue that exemplary criticism only emanates from critics with expansive methodological knowledge.¹¹ At present, questions in rhetorical criticism encourage students to expand their knowledge base. Competitors read additional scholarly materials while preparing for questions. Some of this additional information leads to revisions in their speeches, and some of this material simply helps them answer questions in an informed fashion.

At the coaches' meeting, some instructors argued that a properly-schooled student will pursue abundant scholarship irrespective of the foreboding question period. We admire the idealism of these sentiments, yet this idealism cannot overturn the past and present realities of forensic competition. The Second National Conference on Forensics recognized that "forensics is extremely demanding of students' time and energies."¹² The conference report also stated, "The knowledge that contestants will have the products of their labors compared for the purpose of a judgment motivates them to do their best."¹³ Forensic educators, through this report, clearly recognize that harsh schedules limit competitors to those scholarly pursuits rewarded by competition. If questions no longer reward a student's rhetorical knowledge, students will cease to possess such knowledge.

Questions in rhetorical criticism rounds do help satisfy the educational objectives of forensics. Notwithstanding this conclusion, we must examine the arguments against questioning because not all educational activities are pragmatically or ideologically sound. In this instance, instructors at the coaches' meeting leveled three charges against questioning in rhetorical criticism: (1) questions unfairly designate rhetorical criticism as an elitist event; (2) judges abuse their questioning privileges; and (3) questions impede tournament timing. While these arguments have some merit, we believe they do not justify eliminating a valuable, educational practice.

Those who fear elitism in rhetorical criticism usually brandish the slogan: "We need to have questions in all or no events." These individuals force a very convenient dichotomy which relegates questions to a realm of pragmatic impossibility. These advocates should consider that some universities cannot afford seminars for all their students. Should these institutions eliminate all seminars? Some schools have inadequate forensic budgets which cannot meet the student demand. Should these schools discontinue forensics for the few students they can serve? In both of these scenarios, we

realize that the university should not randomly select students for seminars or forensic activities. Consequently, if we can only have questions in one event, there must be some non-random justification for our selection.

Questions are better suited for rhetorical criticism than any other individual event (although all events would benefit from questions). In no other event do we ask for so much in so short a time. Dean and Benoit, in their content analysis of rhetorical criticism ballots, concluded that judges expect the following: a justification of the artifact, a justification of the methodology, an explanation of the methodology, an application of the method to the artifact, an explanation of the historical context of the artifact, a judgment of the rhetorical effects, and a discussion of the implications of the criticism.¹⁴ Harris' 1978 ballot content analysis reported similar expectations.¹⁵ Larson's survey research indicates "judges hold competitors to the compositional standards of a professional criticism."¹⁶ Many coaches have similarly espoused strong parallels between forensic rhetorical criticism and professional scholarly criticism.¹⁷ In short, we ideally expect a twenty-five page journal article condensed into a ten-minute, insightful, and invigorating presentation.

This high level of expectation has compelled numerous coaches to comment on the harsh time restrictions in this event.¹⁸ Larson's survey study revealed that the most frequently mentioned "general problem" in rhetorical criticism is the restrictive time limits.¹⁹ Since rhetorical criticism couples exorbitant expectations with stringent time restrictions, questions are particularly well-suited to this event. Judges attempting to understand and "flow" the extensive analysis sometimes miss a significant item. With questions, the judge can pursue a clarification. In trying to fulfill the vast expectations, students often omit subpoints which an individual judge may find of consequence. Questions enable a judge to probe an area of interest. At the coaches' meeting, some instructors argued that questions hamper the forensic goal of presenting succinct, complete messages within a specified time limit. A complete and concise rhetorical criticism is impossible within a ten-minute time frame. At least with questions, judges can compensate for the time limit and explore areas which the student simply could not address.

Ironically, even with the high expectations and harsh time limit, rhetorical criticism judges want more and better analysis. Larson found that the most frequent suggestion for improving competition was a call for "more analysis." Dean and Benoit found

that the most common negative comment on rhetorical criticism ballots is that "speakers need to expand their discussions."²⁰ In addition, the majority of rhetorical criticism articles suggest, in some manner, the need for improved arguments and analysis in this event.²¹ If the forensic community truly wishes to improve the analytic quality in rhetorical criticism, then we have lost sight of our own goal by eliminating the question period. Without questions, many students will not pursue additional rhetorical scholarship once their speech is complete. Lesser knowledge requirements cannot lead to improved analysis.

At the coaches' meeting, most opponents of the questioning period argued that too many judges use this time to harass students and flaunt their own knowledge. Some judges do misemploy questions; however, these judges constitute a minority. In 1984, the Rules Committee presented a motion to end questions in rhetorical criticism to the Student Assembly. Christina Reynolds commented that the committee "fully expected to hear resounding support for our position from the students. Instead, the students emphatically [sic] discouraged abolishing the question." Reynolds added, "The students' position eventually led to a committee recommendation that the motion to abolish the question be rejected."²² In 1989, the committee, for presently unexplained reasons, chose not to solicit student opinion on this issue. At the 1989 student assembly, competitors once again firmly favored retaining questions in rhetorical criticism,²³ but the decision to drop the question had been finalized by the council before the students ever met. It is unfortunate that our students devoted the majority of their meeting to this issue when their opinion was of no consequence. Jones stated that many students left the meeting wondering why they bothered to attend at all.

Finally, some opponents of questions in rhetorical criticism argue that questioning disturbs a tournament's timing. These minor disturbances cannot possibly justify ending an educationally sound practice, especially since many factors affect the tournament schedule—not only the presence of questions in an event. The National Forensic Association rules clearly state that each judge is to ask "one question."²⁴ If judges obey the rules, timing problems are minimal. Furthermore, we believe that timing difficulties have been minimal because in the 1985 coaches' meeting, as well as the 1985 *National Forensic Journal* forum on this issue, no opponents of questioning treated timing concerns as a major argument—it was only "tagged on" as an added harm. The Second National Confer-

ence on Forensics warned that coaches must "give primacy to educational objectives in all aspects of forensic activities." The Conference also cautioned that it is easy for "forensic directors to get caught up in the details of administration and lose sight of their central role as educators."²⁵ If we eliminate questions in this event due to timing concerns, we ultimately fall victim to our own admissions.

Questions in rhetorical criticism serve a viable educational purpose, and they should be maintained. Ending questioning based on an "all or none" principle is inconsistent with the expectations and directional goals of this event. Ending questioning because of too many abusive judges is inconsonant with experience, and ending questioning because of inconvenient timing is incompatible with our values as educators. The Second National Conference on Forensics recognized that "there is nothing inherent in a forensics program that insures positive educational outcomes."²⁶ As coaches, the conference report implies, it is our mandate to insure such outcomes. We hope the forensic community will pursue further dialogue on the hastily handled issue of questioning in rhetorical criticism. Cam Jones suggested that the tanks have forever doomed questions in rhetorical criticism. We hope that both his metaphor and its conclusion will have overstated the real case.

NOTES

¹Cam Jones, telephone conversation with author, June 7, 1989.

²Don F. Faules, Richard D. Rieke and Jack Rhodes, *Directing Forensics* (Denver: Morton Publishing Co., 1976), 38. Donald W. Klopff and Carroll P. Lahmann, *Coaching and Directing Forensics* (Skokie: National Textbook Corporation, 1967), 4.

³George Ziegelmüller and Donn W. Parson, "Strengthening Educational Goals and Programs," ed. Donn Parson, in *American Forensics in Perspective: Papers from the Second National Conference on Forensics* (Annandale: Speech Communication Association, 1984), 38.

⁴Ziegelmüller and Parson, 46.

⁵James H. McBath, "Rationale for Forensics," ed. Donn Parson, in *American Forensics in Perspective: Papers from the Second National Conference on Forensics* (Annandale: Speech Communication Association, 1984), 5.

⁶Paul LeRoux, *Selling to a Group: Presentational Strategies* (New York: Barnes and Noble Books, 1984), 129-137. David A. Peoples, *Presentations Plus: David Peoples' Proven Techniques* (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1988), 138-157. Sandy Linver, *Presentations that Work in any Business Situation* (New York: Summit Books, 1983), 222-229. Mary Munter, *Guide to Managerial Communication* (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1982), 119-122. Harold P. Zelko and Frank E.X. Dance, *Business and Professional Speech Communication*, 2nd Ed. (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1978), 302-304. William Phillips Sandford and Willard Hayes Yeager, *Effec-*

tive Business Speech (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1960), 402-405. George L. Morrissey, *Effective Business and Technical Presentations: How to Prepare Your Ideas in Less Time with Better Results* (Reading: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1968), 105-114.

⁷Harold J. Spaeth, *Supreme Court Policy Making: Explanation and Prediction* (San Francisco: W.H. Freeman and Co., 1979), 22.

⁸For the importance of interviews, see Peter Clarke and Susan H. Evans, *Covering Campaigns: Journalism in Congressional Elections* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1983), 28. For the importance of press conferences, see Ray Scherer, "The Presidential Press Conference," ed. Kenneth W. Thompson in *The Media: The Credibility of Institutions, Policies and Leadership*, Vol. 5 (Lanham: University Press of America, 1985), 76. For the importance of debates, see George Gallup, Jr., "The Impact of Presidential Debates on the Vote and Turnout," ed. Joel L. Swerdlow in *Presidential Debates: 1988 and Beyond* (Washington: Congressional Quarterly Inc., 1987), 34-43.

⁹Ziegelmueller and PaTson, 44.

¹⁰Karlyn Kohrs Campbell, *The Rhetorical Act* (Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1982), 16.

¹¹Stephen E. Lucas, "The Schism in Rhetorical Scholarship," *The Quarterly Journal of Speech* 67 (February 1981): 16. Roderick P. Hart, "Contemporary Scholarship in Public Address: A Research Editorial," *The Western Journal of Speech Communication* 50 (Summer 1986): 290. Bernard L. Brock and Robert L. Scott, *Methods of Rhetorical Criticism: A Twentieth-Century Perspective*, 2nd Ed. (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1986): 467.

¹²Ziegelmueller and Parson, 38.

¹³McBath, 5.

¹⁴Kevin W. Dean and William L. Benoit, "A Categorical Content Analysis of Rhetorical Criticism Ballots," *National Forensic Journal* 2 (Fall 1984): 104, 107.

¹⁵Edward J. Harris, Jr., "Rhetorical Criticism: Judges' Expectations and Contest Standards," *National Forensic Journal* 5 (Spring 1987): 22-23.

¹⁶Suzanne Larson, "Communication Analysis: A Survey Research Report," *National Forensic Journal* 3 (Fall 1985): 150.

¹⁷Geisler draws a connection between a competitor in rhetorical criticism and the critic advocated by Edwin Black. See Deborah M. Geisler, "Rhetorical Criticism as an Individual Event: Current Practices and Concerns," *The Forensic* 70 (Fall 1984): 4. Thompson offers two examples of published rhetorical criticism as models for the individual event. See Wayne N. Thompson, "The Contest in Rhetorical Criticism," *The Forensic* 66 (Winter 1981): 18. See also Dan F. Hahn and J. Justin Gustainis, "Rhet Crit: It's Not Rhetorical Criticism," *The Forensic* 68 (Fall 1982): 17. Suzanne McCorkle, "What Place Do Rhetorical Criticism and Communication Analysis Have in the New Forensics Decade?" *The Forensic* 68 (Fall 1982): 18-19. William L. Benoit, "Response to Hahn and Gustainis," *The Forensic* 68 (Spring 1983): 4.

¹⁸Hans and Gustainis, 16-17. Thompson, 18. Harris, 3. See also John M. Murphy, "Rhetorical Criticism as Argument: A Need for Social Criticism," eds. George Ziegelmueller and Jack Rhodes in *Argument in Transition: Proceedings of the Third Summer Conference on Argumentation* (Annandale: Speech Communication Association, 1983), 922. Norbert H. Mills, "Judging Standards in Forensics: Toward a Uniform Code in the 80's," *National Forensic Journal* 1 (Spring 1983): 27.

¹⁹Larson, 152.

²⁰Dean and Benoit, 104.

²¹Geisler, 1-5; Hans and Gustainis, 13-18; Thompson, 17-19, 31; McCorkle, 18-20; Murphy, "Rhetorical Criticism as Argument," 918-925.

See also Brenda J. Logue, "In What Ways Is Argument Applied in the Prepared Speech Events?" eds. George Ziegelmueller and Jack Rhodes in *Dimensions of Argument: Proceedings of the Second Summer Conference on Argumentation* (Annandale: Speech Communication Association, 1981): 384-394. John M. Murphy, "Theory and Practice in Communication Analysis," *The National Forensic Journal* 6 (Spring 1988): 1-11. Robert E. Rosenthal, "Changing Perspectives on Rhetorical Criticism as a Forensic Event," *The National Forensic Journal* 3 (Fall 1985), 128-138.

²²Christina L. Reynolds, "On Questions in Rhetorical Criticism," *National Forensic Journal* 3 (Fall 1985): 173.

²³Cam Jones, telephone interview with author, June 14, 1989.

²⁴National Forensic Association Constitution, By-Laws II (A) (4), (1983).

²⁵Ziegelmueller and Parson, 38.

²⁶McBath, 9.