

January 2006

## Conflating Rules, Norms, and Ethics in Intercollegiate Forensics

Crystal Lane Swift

*Mt. San Antonio College, cswift@mtsac.edu*

Follow this and additional works at: <http://cornerstone.lib.mnsu.edu/speaker-gavel>



Part of the [Speech and Rhetorical Studies Commons](#)

### Recommended Citation

Swift, C.L. (2006). Conflating Rules, Norms, and Ethics in Intercollegiate Forensics. *Speaker & Gavel*, 43, 46-86.

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by Cornerstone: A Collection of Scholarly and Creative Works for Minnesota State University, Mankato. It has been accepted for inclusion in *Speaker & Gavel* by an authorized administrator of Cornerstone: A Collection of Scholarly and Creative Works for Minnesota State University, Mankato.

## Conflating Rules, Norms, and Ethics in Intercollegiate Forensics

Crystal Lane Swift

### Abstract

This paper explores the concepts of rules, norms, and ethics as they pertain to intercollegiate forensic competition. The perspective is taken that these concepts tend to be conflated. Definitions of rules and ethics are drawn primarily from the National Forensics Association (NFA). The pertinent literature is reviewed, methods are explained, and results are reported and discussed. The conclusions pertain to the idea that forensics coaches and students alike are hesitant to accept universal rules and ethics, and prefer more contextualized standards. Suggestions for future research are also offered.

### Introduction

Ethics has long been an important issue for rhetorical education. From the birth of rhetorical study, as evidenced by Aristotle's works, ethics in relation to rhetoric has been highly valued and constantly studied. Aristotle essentially argued that in order to take part in governing, or rules, one must have a clear understanding of morals or ethics, and argued that facts can only be accepted if they are clearly taught.

### Distinctions Between Rules, Norms, and Ethics

Scholars after Aristotle have concurred that there is a conceptual distinction between rules, norms, and ethics. In a *Letter from a Birmingham Jail*, Martin Luther King, Jr. (1963) provided perhaps the most compelling distinction, citing the fact that he was in jail for attempting to uphold ethics, just as Germans hiding Jews in Nazi Germany were breaking the law (rule) of the government (institution). King further argued in favor of rules that uphold ethics, though not all rules currently do. "[T]here are two types of laws: there are *just* laws and *unjust* laws" (emphasis in original, King, 1963, p. 11). King made a distinction between what was right and wrong in the humanistic sense (ethics) as opposed to what is correct and incorrect in the eyes of the law (rules).

In terms of establishing the distinction between rules and norms, Rawls (1999) explained the difference between rules themselves and the way in which individuals choose to operate within them, arguing that rules are written and required by institutions while norms are the socially acceptable behaviors that individuals engage in, in order to meet these requirements. Similarly, in his communicative ethics text, Jensen (1997) classified ethics as theory whereas norms are an interpretation and application of theory to a given culture.

Specifically pertaining to communicative acts, Shimanoff (1980) argued that "rules are followable, prescriptive, contextual, and they pertain to behavior"

Speaker and Gavel, Vol 43 (2006)

[www.dsr-tka.org/](http://www.dsr-tka.org/)

(p. 39). People often have a hard time understanding the consequences of breaking norms before the defiance occurs. Shimanoff (1980) stated that “norms represent average behavior; some rules do not. Rules prescribe behavior; some norms do not” (p. 65). This distinction is essential because thinking of a norm as a rule can lead to the idea that consequences can be applied to situations where they are not intended to be applied.

Conformity to social norms can be a result of threats of punishment that do not actually apply unless recorded rules are broken. Sometimes, however, these concepts are conflated. Rules, norms, and ethics each have their own value and of these three concepts, norms are the least universal. When norms are presented as rules or ethics, students may attempt to apply norms universally. Norms are contextual, but important to given cultures. Habermas (1989) described norms existing within the contexts in which a speaker can judge his own actions in relation to other members within a given context. People feel a need to fit in with their culture. In order to do so, they observe behaviors and communication that takes place within that culture in order to determine the behaviors and communicative acts in which they ought to engage. Hence, an over-emphasis on norms is, especially in teaching, hap-hazard to students.

Nilsen (1966) stated that in order to be ethical, speakers must present information as reasonably, objectively, specifically, and completely as possible. Speech ethics require more than good intentions; understanding must also be reached. Jensen (1997) defined *ethics* as “the moral responsibility to choose, intentionally and voluntarily, oughtness in values like rightness, goodness, truthfulness, justice, and virtue, which may, in a communicative transaction, significantly affect ourselves and others” (emphasis in original, p. 4). He argued that teaching communicative ethics to undergraduates is essential yet problematic, due to the lack of agreement upon definition and employment. This problem could be avoided with clarity in teaching. Nilsen (1966) also established the inherent need for ethics within public address because it has the potential to influence the audience’s choices.

The impact of communication and rhetorical studies affects the students of all fields, but particularly those in the forensic community. The rhetorical scholars of tomorrow come from the classrooms of today, and more frequently, perhaps, from the forensic teams of today. With an emphasis on persuasion and public discourse, ethics has come to occupy a central place in NFA’s guidelines and scholarship. These subjects (rules, norms, and ethics) are perhaps the most frequently studied by forensic scholars, and yet, perhaps, the least understood.

There are a number of ways that scholars have studied forensics. For example, in terms of education in forensics, researchers have addressed a lack of creativity (Derryberry, 1991; Fryar, 1981; Greenstreet, 1990; Reynolds, 1991; Samosky & Baird, 1982), repetition of the same audience (Derryberry, 1991; Reynolds, 1991), vague rules (Greenstreet, 1990), norms that garner competitive success without necessarily helping the student to learn (Reynolds and Fay, 1987, p. 87), and a primary focus on competition over education (Derryberry, 1991; Fryar, 1981; Greenstreet, 1990; Hamm, 1993; Ulrich, 1984).

The NFA has a set of rules and an ethical code for tournament performance; however, intercollegiate forensics competitors and judges do not appear to be using them as guidelines. Even more ambiguous are understandings of ethical and unethical behavior. Hence, it is paramount to understand what behaviors the NFA deem acceptable. Rules themselves tend to be general and subject to interpretation. For example, “Non-published Evidence in All Events Basic Rule: Students may use evidence from non-written sources as long as the veracity of the evidence may be verified” (NFA Code of Ethics, ¶ 8). This ethical code leaves it up to students and coaches alike to decide what veracity *is*, what constitutes *verifiability* and *who* is to verify this veracity. Competitors and coaches, therefore, fill in gaps and interpret rules and norms for themselves, creating their own sets of rules or ethics.

Unwritten rules created and/or interpreted by participants are the social norms within the forensics community and may, in fact, become competitors’ or judges’ basis for what is determined to be ethical and unethical decorum in forensics. Vagueness within the rules themselves, such as never stating a minimum time limit, only a maximum time limit for each event, can result in the conflation of rules and ethics, leaving the forensics community confused and inconsistent. During the 2000-2001 season, for example, an assistant director of forensics commented to her team that the University of California Los Angeles (UCLA) forensics team was *unethical* for wearing jeans and sweaters in competition rather than suits. She continued by stating that she would never award anyone for that behavior in competition. Therefore, her team learned that dress takes precedence over other issues and that the UCLA team would never be able to win her ballot, unless they changed clothes between rounds. Additionally, the emphasis was placed on the clothing *norm* and labeled an issue of *ethics*.

Additionally, during the 2003-2004 season, one of Glendale Community College’s top speakers took a creative approach to her poetry program. Instead of the traditional black book, she chose to put her manuscript on a poster board visual aid, adding words to the board as she spoke. During her speech, many judges would actually stop her, asking her to leave, saying that she was breaking the rules of the event by not having a black book. The rules, however, require the use of a *manuscript*, and not necessarily a *black book*. The black book, therefore, becomes an implicit norm among competitors.

When rules, ethics, and norms are conflated, students are left in a state of ambiguity which forces them to come up with whatever action they deem best. Ethics are discussed frequently in forensic literature as well as within the forensics community. Therefore, it is essential to understand communicative ethics. Scholars in the field have been discussing rules, norms, and ethics in individual events for decades. However, it seems that this apparent problem of over-emphasis on norms and under-emphasis on ethics persists.

### Literature Review

While much of the forensics literature emphasizes the concept of ethics, it seems that the literature is comprised mostly of editorials and opinion pieces. Speaker and Gavel, Vol 43 (2006)

The empirical research that does exist attempts to quantify ethics. In this literature review, I will first introduce an overview of communicative ethics. Next, beginning with oral interpretation, then platform speaking, and finally limited preparation, I will present literature that addresses these concepts by genre. Lastly, I will present the rationale and practical justification for my study.

“The forensic community has an obligation to call attention to ethical issues and disseminate information on the ethics of forensics” (Parson, 1984, p. 19). Unfortunately, the forensics community has not clearly made a distinction between ethics and rules. For instance, Hanson (1986) noted that the lack of nationally accepted rules and ethics creates variance in perception of what behaviors are allowable and what behaviors are not.

Overall, the wording of the rules for forensics are open-ended and vague. Additionally, there is much deliberation over what is acceptable behavior during competition at forensics tournaments. Forensics literature labeled as addressing ethics usually implicitly addresses either norms or rules by the author or by the respondents used in the studies.

Confusion within the literature and the community indicates that further exploration of rules and ethics in forensics is warranted. A number of scholars who study forensics have attempted to uncover the ethical implications of the activity, including: Cronn-Mills (2000), Cronn-Mills and Golden (1997), Endres (1988), Frank (1983), Friedley (1983), Gaskill (1998), Green (1988), Grisez (1965), Hanson (1986), Kuster (1998), Lewis (1988), Pratt (1998), Rice and Mummert (2001), Rosenthal (1985), Sanders (1966), Stewart (1986), Thomas (1983), Thomas and Hart (1983), and VerLinden (1997).

The frequency of discussion of ethics in communication education, and forensics in particular, has led me to think that ethics is considered of the utmost importance in forensics by scholars. Subject matters that have been addressed by forensic researchers regarding ethics include plagiarism (Anderson, 1989; Frank, 1983; Ulrich, 1984), source citation concerns (Anderson, 1989; Frank, 1983; Friedley, 1982; Greenstreet, 1990), coaches writing platform speeches for students (Kalanquin, 1989; Ulrich, 1984), and whether or not tournament administration ought to include competitors and undergraduate students (Ulrich, 1984). Cronn-Mills (2000) argued that the code of ethics and the rules within the National Forensic Association (NFA) lack clarity, and encouraged the organization to reform these. Because ethical implications are inherent in communicative acts, it is essential that organizations have an explicit code of ethics. Mason (1984) stated that a forensics code of ethics should have “the potential for mandating responsibility and accountability on the part of the members of the discipline” (p. 87).

Johannesen (1996), the most often referenced scholar in terms of ethical criterion within forensics, explained 11 functions that a code of ethics must serve: 1) ideal goals rather than minimum standards; 2) aim at ordinary persons; 3) clear and specific; 4) logical and coherent; 5) intended to protect all involved; 6) specific to the given organization; 7) encourage discussion, rather than being static; 8) encompass the overall vision of the given organization; 9) address general ethical principles; 10) many individuals from the organization should be

involved; and 11) enforceable and enforced. Communication and forensics scholars agree that communication educators and the forensics community alike have an obligation to make the ethical expectations explicit to coaches and students alike. These scholars also seem to agree that the NFA code is lacking.

### Oral Interpretation of Literature

The oral interpretation of literature as defined by the NFA, is a continuously debated topic in the forensics community. In an editorial dealing with tournament behavior, Kuster (1998) argued that forensic coaches teach values, which necessitates the creation of specific boundaries in event creation and execution. Kuster’s main concern was that if students are not given stricter guidelines by which to choose their interpretation pieces, programs would lose funding, because many competitive interpretation pieces exceed his idea of what should be acceptable within forensics norms.

Gaskill (1998) disagreed with Kuster, arguing that rather than imposing values on students, forensic coaches should instead teach diversity. Students ought to be prepared for exposure to interpretation events that they find offensive or distasteful. Pratt (1998) agreed with Kuster and called for a change in practice. He justified his claim by pointing out that it is not good or bad taste but judgment which is in question. It is important to note that this spat about what should and should not be allowed in competitive oral interpretation pieces is an on-going debate that questions ever-changing norms and at many times, calls for new or revised rules. However, very few authors explain the controversy in that way. Instead, it is discussed in extremes: either as a matter of simple preference or universal morals.

Ford and Green (1987) defined original material as “any work of prose, poetry or dramatic literature written by a student competitor or for a student competitor specifically for use in competition” (p. 1). Providing one’s own name as an author does not usually yield competitive success. Endres (1988) wrote that NFA and American Forensic Association (AFA) technically accept original literature in competition; however, he argued students who veil original work with pen names are engaging in “unethical conduct” (p. 108). While it may very well be true that the NFA’s unwritten expectations or norms reject original material in competition, this does not support that original material has any moral implication.

Green (1988) explained that NFA ought to address whether or not original material is allowable in competition. Only AFA has taken a stance thus far on the issue, allowing one piece of a student’s POI to be original. Green argued that it is unethical for students to use original material because they write to “fit the conventions of the event,” which he said is “unfair.” (1988, p. 71). Issues of fairness are at the heart of ethical concerns. The conventions (or norms) of the event, however, are not. “I feel it is unethical for a student to use original in the same round as students using non-original material” (Green, 1988, p. 71). His argument to create a rule is justified by his perception of an ethical violation.

Lewis (1988) opposed Green’s position, arguing that AFA and NFA have “appropriately addressed the issue of original oral interpretive material . . . [for Speaker and Gavel, Vol 43 (2006) [www.dsr-tka.org/](http://www.dsr-tka.org/)]

they] do not question the integrity or ethics of a competitor who chooses to present original material” (p. 65). This argument seems more of an issue of neglect than of trust. Lewis addresses this gap in defined policy, or lack of a rule, as good because it indicates that the national organizations do not question the ethics of competitors.

While there seems to be no resolution about whether original material in oral interpretation is “ethical,” Cronn-Mills and Golden (1997) explored the events’ norms as drawn from their own experiences with oral interpretation. This article did not seem to conflate many concepts, but did argue that norms are the most highly valued concept by forensics competitors. There were eight norms presented: 1) teasers are required; 2) there are permissible and impermissible ways to use a manuscript; 3) competitors must move in certain ways; 4) the expected minimum time differs by event; 5) literature should be fresh and fit the performer; 6) literature must be so new that no one has heard of it; 7) in program pieces, literature should fit together seamlessly; 8) there should only be two characters in duo pieces. Rice and Mummet (2001) studied whether or not norms were perceived by the forensics community through survey research. They found that interpreters do perceive norms to exist.

### Platform Speaking

In addition to the ambiguity and conflict surrounding interpretation of literature events, questions do exist about platform events. The rules for platform events are still not as specific as they could be. For example, the rules for informative speaking state, “The contestant will deliver an original factual speech on a realistic subject to fulfill a general information need of the audience. Visual aids that supplement/reinforce the message are permitted. The speech must be delivered from memory. Maximum 10 minutes” (NFA individual events rules, 2000, ¶ 5, see appendix A). Informative speaking does not explicitly require visual aids, but most successful informative presentations in competition make use of a poster board at some point during the speech. Also, there is no suggested format for the speech, but most informative speeches in competition are arranged chronologically. This is an example of a norm that students follow as if it were a rule.

Perhaps the clearest justification for study in this area comes from Friedley (1983), who stated, “while textbooks provide little focus on the ethical use of evidence in original speech events [platform speeches], the forensics community as a whole has clearly demonstrated a concern for the ethics issue” (p. 110). Pragmatically, those involved in forensics are, at the very least, highly concerned with ethics. However, on a theoretical level, they seem to be, at worst, without a definition at all, and at best, at odds with one another. This conflict of conclusions leads to many scholars being prescriptive, with little to no resolution in the community. Until there is agreement and uniformity regarding ethics in platform speeches, this conflict will remain.

Frank (1983) conducted a qualitative study of the 1981 final round of persuasive speeches at the NFA National Individual Event Tournament. Frank did an in-depth analysis of all six speakers. He found that the competitors, in

varying degrees, committed fabrication, source deception, and plagiarism. Four of the six speakers fabricated evidence, all six speakers committed source deception, and one speaker extensively plagiarized. Frank conjectured that the reason for the lack of integrity in this final round was the need to win. Frank concluded by suggesting that there needs to be a national effort to enforce the rules against this behavior. Although his research was conducted over 20 years ago, it seems that there has been no national effort to do so.

In another study addressing norms in platform speeches, VerLinden (1997) identified what he believed to be the “unwritten rules” or norms of platform speeches. He argued that there are 11 norms in platform speaking: 1) topics must be fresh; 2) personal solutions are required in persuasion; 3) informative topics must be relative to the audience; 4) informative speeches must have visual aids; 5) persuasion speeches must have no visual aids; 6) speech to entertain must create huge, positive audience response; 7) communication analyses must use a published, critical method; 8) all platform speeches must have a myriad of sources; 9) sources must have a complete date which must be as current as possible; 10) persuasive speeches prohibit the speaker from showing emotion; and 11) speeches must be memorized.

Overall, VerLinden (1997) concluded that norms do not change quickly, and the only way to make significant changes would be to make written rules that change the current behaviors that the community as a whole rejects. However, he noted that this may not come across on ballots in competition. He encouraged forensics coaches to teach norms to their students, so that they would understand the cultural expectations of the forensics community. VerLinden encouraged a clear distinction between the norms (or “unwritten rules”) and rules of forensics. Changes in rules need to occur to increase understanding.

Addressing norms, Rice and Mummet (2001) furthered studied judges’ and competitors’ perceptions of event expectations. Judges and competitors disagreed about what constituted ethical behavior in specific events through answers to survey research. The authors found that most competitors and judges agree that norms do exist in platform events. Rice and Mummet conjectured that this understanding of norms could be due to the fact that they are normally negatively worded. It is easier to understand what *not* to do than to understand the seemingly infinite number of things *to* do. The authors suggest that “perhaps an exploration of these rules and testing them in more contexts . . . would prove more educationally enriching” (Rice & Mummet, 2001, p. 14).

### Limited Preparation

While there was little literature solely on limited preparation events, several articles dealing with platform speaking or individual events as a whole addressed limited preparation events. Most literature written about limited preparation events deals specifically with norms. For instance, Rice and Mummet (2001) found through survey research that competitors perceive there to be unwritten rules (or norms) in limited preparation events. In particular, respondents reported that there is an unwritten rule that impromptu speeches

Speaker and Gavel, Vol 43 (2006)

[www.dsr-tka.org/](http://www.dsr-tka.org/)

must be prepared in less than 2 minutes, and the respondents understood that this norm is not required by the rules.

Also through survey research, Thomas and Hart (1983) found that regarding ethics, limited preparation competitors and judges are less unified with their opinions than those having to do with norms. They stated that “an extemp [oraneous] speaker’s file contains two fully prepared speeches on topics likely to be drawn. Responses to this item show that respondents had mixed feelings about it” (Thomas and Hart, 1983, p. 84). Student and coach respondents alike had a hard time labeling the aforementioned behavior as entirely ethical or unethical. Items throughout the Thomas and Hart study reinforced disagreement regarding ethics in limited preparation events. “Opinions were divided on the statement that it is more ethical for an extemporaneous speech to provide an unambiguous answer to the question than one which does not” (Thomas and Hart, 1983, p. 88). More study clearly needs to be conducted on limited preparation events regarding rules, norms, and ethics.

### Rationale and Justification

In spite of this ascribed preoccupation with ethics, there seems to be confusion as to what exactly constitutes ethical behavior, as ethics is too often conflated with rules and norms. NFA’s code of ethics, for example, depends on corresponding rules to clarify the ethical code. Moreover, many of the studies listed above, while ostensibly conducted to examine ethical practice, tend to address primarily rules or norms, not ethics. Causality of this problem and confusion could lie on two fundamental levels: 1) forensics rules are inherently ambiguous; and 2) there is a disconnect between ethics in theory and in practice. If this is the case, ambiguity of rules and disparity between the theory and practice of ethics seem, in and of themselves, intrinsically unethical. Shimanoff (1980) explained that “communication scholars often use the terms rule and norm interchangeably.” (p.63). This practice can be confusing and detrimental to students. Additionally, forensics literature seems to emphasize the importance of norms over the importance of ethics and attempts to quantify ethics, due to the vast number of quantitative studies and scarcity of qualitative studies.

Which behaviors are ethical and which are not remains unresolved and a point of contention within forensic competition. To improve the community aspect of forensic competition, and also its educational value, a specific, uniform forensics code of ethics could be developed. This research aims to assess to what extent rules, ethics and norms are conflated in the forensics community, and to examine the potential confusion that exists when ethics are conflated with rules and norms. No previous study has compared student and coach perceptions of these concepts, and most of the literature on ethics in forensics does not provide an adequate distinction between rules and ethics or norms and ethics. Hence, this type of study is warranted. The results could serve to show just how prevalent the conflation of these terms are, and then be used to improve coach-student communication about the concepts, providing NFA with a more solid ethical foundation. The community at large does value ethics, but what that specifically means varies. This is key to my study. As a result of the perceived

limitations in forensics literature on rules, norms, and ethics, the following research questions are posed:

- RQ1: What reasons do coaches give for being involved in forensics? Can their students accurately identify why they are involved?
- RQ2: What concepts do coaches teach in forensics? Can their students accurately identify these concepts?
- RQ3: Which of these three concepts—rules, ethics, and norms—is the most emphasized by coaches and students in intercollegiate forensics?
- RQ4: What kind of problems do coaches and students identify in the three genres of individual events?
- RQ5: Do coaches and students conflate the concepts of rules, norms, and ethics?

### Method

I referred to the National Forensic Association Individual Event rules (see appendix A) for this study because of the prominence of NFA as a forensic organization. Additionally, the NFA Code of Ethics (1991, see appendix B) raised nine areas regarding ethical behavior in forensics, and each was responded to with a basic rule. These basic rules contain evaluative terms, begging interpretation. Rather than distinctly defining *ethics* and *rules*, this code of *ethics* lists a basic *rule* for each *ethical* issue.

While much of the research done on ethics in forensics has been quantitative in nature, I designed a questionnaire that utilized qualitative and quantitative items. The qualitative questions were designed to encourage the respondents to answer candidly, by being as open-ended as possible. I sought to find 1) why coaches are involved in forensics, 2) what concepts coaches value in forensics, 3) what concept is most stressed in forensics, 4) the problems coaches and students perceive in forensics, and 5) whether coaches and students discuss, value, or confuse rules, norms, and ethics.

With the goal of collecting and interpreting a total of 20 questionnaires from coaches and 60 from their students, I issued questionnaires (see appendix C) to 20 coaches and 60 students attending the 35<sup>th</sup> Annual Age of Aquarius Forensics Invitational at Ball State University, 20 coaches and 60 students attending the 57<sup>th</sup> annual L. E. Norton Forensics Invitational at Bradley University, and 20 coaches and 60 students attending the 3<sup>rd</sup> Annual SCUDL Swing at California State University Fullerton. Though the last tournament occurred on the west coast, which is traditionally more AFA-oriented, there were many NFA schools represented. (I also posted the questionnaire to the Individual Event Listserv as well as Net Benefits, a parliamentary debate forum. Only three of the surveys were returned electronically. None of the electronically submitted surveys came from Net Benefits.)

### Description of the Questionnaire

The questionnaires were worded slightly differently for coaches than for students. The coach questionnaire asked for a self-report and the student Speaker and Gavel, Vol 43 (2006)

questionnaire asked for the student's perspective of his or her coach. I compared the students' perspectives of their coach to the coaches' perspectives of how they communicate with their students. Section 1 simply collected demographic data from all of the coaches and students. Section 2 asked 7 questions about the coach's philosophy pertaining to forensics. The data from section 3 asked about the perceived problems in forensics. These questions were intended to determine whether ethics, rules, or norms are important to the coach. Additionally, these questions asked students about their coach's philosophy in order to determine whether the coach has communicated their philosophy effectively to his or her students.

Questions 1 and 2 were designed to answer RQ1 by asking why the coach is involved and why the activity is important. Question 2 was designed to answer RQ2 by asking what is the most important concept the coach teaches. Questions 4-7 were designed to answer RQ3 by asking about the NFA codes and educational and competitive goals. Section 3 collected data regarding the problems coaches and students perceive in competition, designed to answer RQ4. One question addressed limited preparation events, one question addressed platform speeches, and one question addressed oral interpretation of literature. Each open-ended answer was assessed and coded according to the words used in the written responses. These answers, once labeled as rules, norms, ethics, or other was compared between coaches and students.

I used a 4 prong model to code responses to section 3. The responses were labeled, by response, in one of 4 categories (rules, norms, ethics, or other), using the following definitions: *Ethics* addresses issues of fairness, enabling distinctions between right and wrong. Answers that address honesty, fairness, morals, etc. were coded as issues of ethics. If a coach identified citing a source that does not exist in a platform speech as a problem, it was coded as an issue of ethics because that is lying.

*Rules* are simply tangible articulations of justice. Rules are the "laws" that a given group or organization has established in order to maintain order. Issues determined by rules are questions of what is correct and incorrect. They are uniformly enforceable (Irwin, 1999; Shimanoff, 1980). In contrast to ethics, rules do not necessarily have any moral implications. I referred to National Forensic Association Individual Event rules (see appendix A) to determine answers that deal with rules. Only answers that address issues from these rules were coded as rule issues. If a coach identified speaking 10 minutes for extemporaneous speaking as a problem, it was coded as a rule issue, because the rules explicitly state that 7 minutes is the maximum speaking time.

*Norms* are by far the most contextual issues. Because norms are culturally constructed, they need no validity outside of their acceptance by members of the culture (Edgerton 1985; Habermas, 1989). Answers addressing issues with no moral impact and not addressed in the rules were coded as norms. If a coach identified movement from the waist down in oral interpretation as a problem, it was considered an issue of norms, because there is no moral implication to that action, nor is there any rule prohibiting that action.

The other category included all answers that were not focused on behaviors that competitors engage in. For instance, there were many answers that addressed tournament administration. These answers fell outside of the focus of this study.

Section 4 listed 16 scenarios, each of which may be perceived as an ethical, rule, norm, or no violation. This data answered RQ5 by asking the participants to identify the type of violation the prompt represented. The answers were evaluated to determine whether coaches and students are mixing the concepts independently, according to the aforementioned definitions. The coach and student groups were then compared to one another to determine whether there is consistency between coach and student perceptions.

### Results and Analysis

Participants consisted of 20 coaches and 43 students. All together there were 30 schools represented. 10 students were freshmen, 7 were sophomores, 13 were juniors, and 6 were seniors. Nine of the coaches were assistant coaches and 11 were directors of forensics. Of the 63 participants, 52 were involved in, competing in, or coaching interpretation of literature events; 49 were involved in, competing in, or coaching, platform events; 45 were involved in, competing in, or coaching limited preparation events; and 21 were involved in, competing in, or coaching debate. Of the 240 surveys distributed, 63 were completed and returned, providing a 26% rate of return.

### Reasons for Involvement

In order to analyze the responses to the goals and philosophy portion of the survey (section 2), I used an inductive approach. I first coded each response with a narrow term such as academic or skills, and then looked at all of the terms to find common, emergent themes. For instance, the aforementioned examples merged into the education category. I grouped the responses by category until I found three to six primary themes or responses for each of the seven goal/philosophy questions. For questions one and two (why the coach is involved and why forensics is important to the coach), respondents identified one of four themes: 1) enjoyment, 2) education, 3) competition, and 4) do not know (see tables 1 and 2).

Participants whose responses fit into the enjoyment category expressed a deep love and need for the activity. Many respondents explained that they enjoy the activity because of the diversity within the forensics culture and a need to increase participation. These respondents used words like passion, lifer, tradition, and fulfillment to explain why they (or their coaches) are involved in the activity and why forensics is important to them (or their coaches). One student responded, "I believe my coach is involved in forensics because they enjoyed the activity as competitors and continue to love it." Another student responded that their coach was involved with forensics for "The people and the love of performance." Another student claimed, "It's her passion and I think she would work hard at anything she was passionate about." More simply, a student wrote, "She loves it [forensics]." Coaches clearly conveyed their enjoyment of

Speaker and Gavel, Vol 43 (2006)

[www.dsr-tka.org/](http://www.dsr-tka.org/)

forensics by writing things like, “I love the activity,” or “I think forensics helps people get to know other people (network) in ways not available otherwise.”

**Table 1**  
Why the Coach is Involved in Forensics

	Students	Coaches
Enjoyment	32	15
Education	7	4
Competition	1	0
Do Not Know	3	1

**Table 2**  
Why Forensics is Important to the Coach

	Students	Coaches
Enjoyment	24	15
Education	16	5
Competition	1	0
Do Not Know	2	0

Coaches and students whose responses fit into the education category explained the long-term, pragmatic benefits of forensics. They said that the research skills attained in forensics could be beneficial later on in academia, and the public speaking skills would be useful in jobs after forensics. These respondents seem to view forensics as rhetorical training, and justify the importance of, and their involvement in, forensics with the potential benefits forensics could have on students in the real world. One student wrote, “This activity is important to our coaches because they are able to take what they learned and proliferate it.” Another student wrote, “Competitive speaking teaches us to be comfortable speaking in front of friends and strangers.” One coach wrote that they are involved in forensics because, “It is very educational.” Another coach responded that they are involved in forensics, “To help students on becoming better public speakers.”

Students whose responses fit into the competition category expressed that the purpose of forensics was the end goal of competitive success. These respondents usually had short answers, simply stating that the reason that forensics is important and the reason they are involved is simply to win, to help students win, or to do well in competition. These respondents seem to view forensics as foremost a competition. One student stated that forensics was important to their coach and their coach was involved in forensics simply “to win.”

The “do not know” category consisted of responses that expressed a lack of communication on the subject between coaches and students. Coaches who fit into this category tended to have been forced, by circumstance, into the coaching position, and have no previous forensics experience. Students who expressed not

knowing why their coach was involved in forensics or why forensics was important to the coach stated that they had never asked their coach, seemingly expressing that it was the student’s responsibility to ask the coach this information, rather than the coach’s responsibility to tell the student.

In answer to RQ1, “What reasons do coaches give for being involved in forensics? Can their students accurately identify why they are involved?” the data suggests that coaches are involved in forensics because they enjoy the activity. Their students understand that this is why their coaches are involved, which is indicated by the fact that 74% of student respondents and 75% of coach respondents answered that the reason the coach is involved in forensics is because of enjoyment. Additionally, 56% of student participants and 75% of coach participants reported that the reason that forensics is important to the coach is enjoyment. Clearly, the results show that coaches enjoy forensics and their students recognize this. This finding indicates that coaches and students communicate openly about why forensics is important to the coach and why he or she is involved in forensics. It is encouraging that this communication is open, because forensics is an activity grounded in communication. It seems from the data set, that coaches are communicating well with their students, regarding their involvement in forensics.

### Concepts Coaches Teach

The next question on the survey asked what the most important concept coaches teach their student is. Six categories emerged from the data: 1) enjoyment, 2) education, 3) doing your best, 4) individuality, 5) ethics, and 6) nothing (see table 3).

**Table 3**  
The Most Important Concept the Coach Teaches

	Students	Coaches
Enjoyment	5	4
Education	9	5
Do Your Best	20	8
Individuality	2	2
Ethics	5	1
Nothing	2	0

Coaches and students whose responses fit into the enjoyment category usually stated that having fun was the most important concept taught by the coach. These respondents also used descriptions like “fun,” “enjoyment,” “fulfillment,” and “contentment” to explain the most important concept. These respondents seem to value having fun with forensics.

Coaches and students whose responses fit into the category of education used a variety of educational and training terms to describe the most important concept taught by the coach. The respondents indicated that concepts such as hard work, critical thinking skills, and professionalism were the most important

thing taught by their coach. These respondents likely value the long-term effects of forensics as rhetorical training.

The responses that fit into the category of do your best all responded specifically that doing your best was the most important concept taught by their coach. This could be interpreted in many ways. The best, according to the coach, could mean specifically a trophy or simply doing better than in the past. Although students did not claim that their coach primarily valued forensics competition, the most important concept that students claimed that their coach teaches them was overwhelmingly competitively-based. Students who responded that the most important concept that their coach teaches them is do your best competitively, wrote things like, "Learn your lines!" "Quality over quantity," "Win as much as you can," "Everything I do reflects on the team," and "To try to win, and try again." Coaches who cited competitive-based concepts as the most important concept they teach their students wrote things like, "Do your best for the team," "Teamwork," "Make sure you win," and "Be competitive."

Responses that fit into the individuality category expressed the importance of the uniqueness and diversity in forensics events. They used words like "freedom," "autonomy," and "choice" to describe the most important concept taught by the coach. These respondents likely highly value the message itself in forensics. One student simply wrote "individuality" and a coach wrote "autonomy from what everyone else does in forensics."

The responses that fit into the category of ethics were concise. Participants used words such as "truthfulness," "integrity," and "honesty" to describe the most important concept. Very few wrote an explanation with their word of choice. These respondents likely view forensics as a classic rhetorical forum. One coach responded, "ethics leads to a good life."

There were only two student participants whose responses fit into the category of nothing. They wrote specifically nothing or N/A. These students may be in the midst of an interpersonal conflict with their coaches.

In answer to RQ2, "What concepts do coaches teach in forensics? Can their students accurately identify these concepts?," the results suggest that "do your best in competition" is the most frequently cited as the most important concept the coach teaches, as indicated by 47% of the students and 40% of the coaches. The second most frequent response was "education" by 21% of the students and 25% of the coaches. It is interesting that competitive success is reported as significantly more important than education to coaches because coaches are also (usually) communication teachers. Intuitively, it seems that coaches would naturally value education over any other concept. However, the results indicate otherwise. The competitive aspect of forensics may overshadow the educational value on many teams.

Culturally, it follows that coaches would train their students to be competitive over valuing education. The United States operates on a level of capitalism, and values capitalism. Perhaps coaches are serving their students well by training them to be highly competitive.

### Emphasis on Norms

The next question asked what the biggest challenge in achieving competitive goals is. Four themes emerged: 1) norms, 2) belief in self, 3) work load, and 4) team budget (see table 4).

**Table 4**  
The Biggest Challenge in Achieving Competitive Success

	Students	Coaches
Norms	12	10
Belief in Self	9	2
Work Load	20	6
Team Budget	1	2

Coaches and students whose responses fit into the norms category expressed a frustration with bias for some styles over others and name recognition winning ballots above all else. There was a general conclusion of helplessness and inability to change others' perspective of norms. These respondents are probably willing to conform to win. One student stated "Passing the politics. Forensics is full of judges that have their favorites, regardless of their knowledge of it," indicating that norm expectations are a frustration in achieving competitive success. The student seems upset that not all judges agree on what is acceptable and what is not. Another student's frustration with this disparity in expectations was: "Interpretation of rules by my judges collectively." A more explicit example was when a student stated "Having to conform to the social norms within speech and debate. This is the most challenging because it is the most stringent aspect that is not made explicit." A more implicit example, which simply described some of the norm expectations, was "Complex arguments for debate and lowering my voice for IE'S." Another student said that "Dealing with the upset of not winning—this activity is subjective and some refuse to accept that!" was the biggest challenge in achieving competitive goals. Finally, a student wrote that their frustration was "The different opinions. You can never please everyone all the time."

Coaches stated their frustration with norms in several ways. For instance, one coach stated that the biggest challenge in achieving competitive goals was "having a level playing field. I believe there is bias towards specific schools, students." Another said, "Finding topics and literature because you're always trying to be on the 'cutting edge' but how much new stuff is really out there year after year?" Another coach wrote, "Knowing what judges are looking for. Even if you have the most talented competitors and the perfect scripts or speeches; you can't predict judges or their preferences." More specifically, a coach responded, "name recognition & the challenge to 'beat' an individual or school name. This stifles the paradigm of judges & has psychological implications on the competitor. {Ex: Before the tournament starts, '[name of one of the most nationally competitively successful teams]' has already beaten '[name of less competitively successful school]'}" This coach is expressing a frustration with the assumptions that judges have upon entering competition. Judges tend to

vote in favor of those schools that have repetitive success in competition. It is a norm that competitive success is seen in forensic competition by the same schools over and over.

Participants whose responses fit into the belief in self category expressed a great frustration with general anxiety that they, themselves, or their students experience before and during competition. These responses focused on personal achievement and performance in round rather than results from the tournament. These respondents are likely to value personal victories more than trophies. One student responded, "For me, it is believing in myself. I often feel that other competitors are better than me when they aren't." A coach wrote "At times, it is hard to get students to believe in their own abilities."

The responses that fit into the category of work load consisted of expressions of a need for more follow-through, teamwork, motivation, and acceptance of criticism. These responses clearly set forth that competitive goals are impossible without a great deal of effort. These respondents seem to focus on the process more than the end result in forensics. A student responded, "Getting people to work on their event. Many people don't want to do research." Another student wrote, "Time restraints becoming debilitating because of practice and school." A coach wrote that the biggest challenge was "having students who follow through."

Coaches and students whose responses fit into the team budget category expressed a frustration with the lack of support from their administration. These responses highlighted the inequity between programs and the need for a large budget in order to win. These respondents may value fairness in forensics. A student wrote, "we just don't have the money." A coach responded, "Budget. It impacts everything; faculty help, tournament schedule, scholarships for the best talent, and retention."

The next question asked what the biggest challenge in achieving educational goals is. Four themes emerged: 1) prioritizing, 2) administrative concerns, 3) ethics, and 4) do not know (see table 5).

**Table 5**  
The Biggest Challenge in Achieving Educational Goals

	Students	Coaches
Prioritizing	39	16
Administrative Concerns	1	2
Ethics	0	2
Do Not Know	2	0

Coaches and students whose responses fit into the prioritizing category expressed a need for students to balance school and forensics. Respondents in this category wrote that there is a need for a shift in priorities for forensics competitors. These participants stated that things like social activism and education ought to be seen as more important than winning in forensics, and students need a motivation for this shift. A student wrote, "Forcing myself to study." Another student responded, "Not letting bad things effect your

schoolwork. No grade means no competition." Another student stated, "Pushing yourself. In college there is so much going on outside of class. One can get distracted from their studies and not push themselves to achieve their goals."

A coach responded to this question, "Many students who want to compete do not take the educational classes. Hence, they are frustrated and have difficulty learning new techniques while trying to compete at the same time." Another coach wrote, "Motivating students. I think competitive success is a by-product of educational growth. It is hard for students to balance both."

Participants whose responses fit into the administrative concerns category stated that their own administration tends to hinder education in forensics. The reason for this hindrance was a lack of a budget. These respondents seem to believe that the most education in forensics happens at tournaments. A coach wrote, "Budget. Without additional help, I can't adequately coach and mentor on an individual basis."

The coaches whose responses fit into the ethics category simply stated that other concepts are valued more than ethics in forensics. These participants claimed that forensics should focus more on ethics. Unethical practices to these participants, hinders education. These responses were simply, "ethics."

The responses that fit into the do not know category stated that had no idea what the problem was. There seemed to be a lack of understanding of what the cause of these educational challenges were amongst these respondents. A student responded, "I have no idea."

The next question asked how much the coach knew about the NFA rules and code of ethics. There were four categories of responses: 1) nothing, 2) some, 3) everything, 4) do not know (see table 6).

**Table 6**  
What the Coach Knows About the NFA Rules and Code of Ethics

	Students	Coaches
Nothing	3	4
Some	10	13
Everything	22	3
Do Not Know	8	0

Coaches and students whose responses fit into the category of nothing literally stated that the coach knew nothing. Many stated that the reason was that their school did not attend NFA. Student respondents were especially defensive of the coaches by stating that they thought it didn't matter that their coach knew nothing of these codes. They stated that the coach knew "Nothing" or "Nothing at all" about the NFA rules and code of ethics.

Contributors whose responses fit into the category of some responded that the coach knew some, enough, or listed a rule or two to illustrate what the coach knew. Many coaches in this category wrote that they were aware that the rules and code of ethics existed but they had read them a long time ago. Many coaches in this category expressed that they didn't really need the NFA code, anyhow.

Participants whose responses fit into the category of everything either stated that the coach knew a lot, served on the NFA board, or knew, literally everything. Students did not seem hesitant to write that their coach knew everything, while coaches seemed to need to justify their response with their position on the board or other experience

Obviously, only students responded that they did not know. Students whose responses fit into this category wrote that they had never asked, as if it was their responsibility to initiate communication on this subject. They seemed defensive and supportive of their coaches. Many responded that they did not know, but their coach probably knew everything. Students wrote simply, "I don't know," or implied that they did not know by writing things like: "More than me?"

The final question in section 2 inquired as to how coaches refer to the NFA rules and code of ethics. Three themes emerged: 1) my own ethics, 2) not at all, and 3) case by case (see table 7).

**Table 7**  
How the Coach Refers to the NFA Rules and Code of Ethics

	Students	Coaches
My Own Ethics	16	6
Not at All	11	6
Case by Case	16	8

Coaches and students whose responses fit into my own ethics category stated that the coach did not need the NFA rules and code of ethics because they had a better system of rules and ethics, which they used instead. Students wrote especially highly of their coaches' codes, stating that they were the best or really knew what they were doing. Beyond not knowing anything about the NFA rules and code of ethics or simply not referring to them, there were students who stated that the coach had a different set of rules and code of ethics for their team than the NFA rules and code of ethics.

A student wrote that his or her coach's standards were superior to those of the NFA. "I think he is knowledgeable about it however, I am not sure he really is afraid of breaking them because he thinks individuality means more than blending in." That student indicated that the coach had an attitude of non-conformity. A student explained, "We aren't allowed to make up sources or anything. This isn't in the code of ethics, but we can't say negative things about members of other teams at tournaments." Almost defensive of his or her coach, one student wrote, "[Name of coach] is quite ethical. He allows us to write our own intros and does not write our speeches. Coaches that give hand-outs to students isn't for the benefit of any student. We write our intros. We also encourage one another."

Another student responded, "Above all we must follow his strict code. All of our work is thoroughly checked and any hint of wrongdoing is swiftly and strongly handled. Basically, it has become ingrained in us to be ethical and original." Coaches wrote responses like, "My students are more concerned about

meeting my standards of ethical behaviors than national organizations guidelines; which is ok because my standards are more rigorous and my enforcement more rigorous." Coaches seem to believe that they know what is best for their team over the NFA. Another similar response was, "I do not refer to a literal code but I still like to make sure to keep ethics a part of my coaching. I let students know what I think is unethical and why, however, my ability to enforce these on the team is limited because I am not the head coach. What the head coach decides overrides my decisions."

Contributors whose responses fit into the not at all category simply stated that the coach never referred to the NFA rules or code of ethics. Most coaches especially in this category expressed no need to refer to the rules or code of ethics. These people most likely believe that the rules and code of ethics do not need to be addressed unless one of their standards has been violated. One student simply responded, "My coach does not refer to that code of ethics." Another student wrote, that "[the NFA code] Does not come up in coaching." Students seem to have faith in their coach about not referring to the code, however. For instance, one student wrote, "There is no need [to refer to the NFA code]."

Participants whose responses fit into this category of case by case expressed that the coach addressed the rules and code of ethics differently with each student, usually one-on-one. These answers ranged from talking about the NFA rules and code of ethics on a regular basis to only discussing them when one was broken. These respondents likely value the NFA rules and code of ethics. A student wrote, "She lets you know if something is cheating according to the rules, but is honest that it goes on with other teams." One coach responded "Through personal experience."

In addition to students recognizing that their coaches were either unaware of the NFA code or simply did not use it, coaches' answers seemed to correspond. There were 4 coaches who stated that the coach knew nothing about the NFA rules and code of ethics. They stated, simply that they knew "Nothing," or more explicitly, one coach wrote, "I know there is a lot of confusion about NFA rules but I, myself have never actually read them. I was unaware that an NFA code of ethics existed." Some coaches who stated simply that they did not refer to the NFA rules and code of ethics at all wrote "N/A," while others seemingly defended their position, "We've had no need to address the code of ethics."

In answer to RQ3, "Which of these three concepts, rules, ethics, and norms is the most emphasized by coaches and students in intercollegiate forensics?," the data says that norms are most emphasized. In response to the biggest challenge in achieving competitive success, 28% of students and 50% of coaches indicated "norms." However, 47% of students and 30% of coaches reported "work load." The difference in frequencies between students and coaches suggests that coaches are more concerned with conformity than are their students. Students seem more concerned with performance and balance.

Additionally, respondents indicated that there is a fundamental distinction between competitive success and educational goals. Coding the question involving educational goals yielded four categories that did not appear in the Speaker and Gavel, Vol 43 (2006)

competitive success categories. In fact, 91% of students and 80% of coaches reported that the biggest challenge in achieving educational goals is “prioritizing,” while only 10% of coaches and no students reported that “ethics” is the biggest challenge in this area. It is interesting that ethics was not a response when it came to competition, and only reported twice as a response when it came to education. Norms are clearly more emphasized.

Further, the NFA rules and code of ethics seem to be a non-issue to most of the participants. When asked about how much the coach knows about the rules and code of ethics, 23% of students and 65% of coaches reported that the coach knows “some,” while 51% of students and 15% of coaches reported that the coach knows “everything.” This indicates that students are quicker to have confidence in their coach’s knowledge than the coach is to have in their own knowledge. These results also suggest that coaches are fairly familiar with the NFA rules and code of ethics.

However, when asked how the coach refers to the NFA rules and code of ethics, 63% of students and 60% of coaches indicated that the coach does not refer to those codes. More specifically, 26% of students and 30% of coaches reported that the coach simply does not refer to the NFA rules and code of ethics, while 37% of students and 30% of coaches went beyond that to say that coaches do not refer to the NFA rules and code of ethics, and also have their own code of ethics. It seems that forensic coaches reject the top-down approach because they and their students indicate that the coach is knowledgeable about the NFA rules and code of ethics. However, the results also indicate that coaches either do not refer to these codes that they are knowledgeable about, or go beyond simply ignoring the codes to creating their own. Clearly, coaches value their students as individuals and feel that they know what is best for their students. Reciprocally, students clearly value their relationship with their coach and trust their coach’s knowledge.

### Problems with Events in Competition

In section 3, participants were asked to list the top three problems in competition with each genre of individual event. These answers were coded according to the previously developed definitions of rules, ethics, and norms. The participants were asked to open-endedly list in order the three most prevalent problems in competition with the three genres of individual events. Each answer was coded as a rule, norm, ethic, or other issue. The most frequently mentioned problems in limited preparation events were norms issues (see table 8).

**Table 8**  
Total Problems in Limited Preparation

	Students	Coaches
Rule	14	0
Norm	50	38
Ethic	8	7
Other	33	12

Some of the norm issues that students cited as problems in limited preparation events were: “Judging being different requires different styles,” “Remembering examples,” “Structure,” “Walking,” “Subjective,” “Balancing naturalness with rhetoric,” “Not using note cards,” “Prep [aration] Time,” “Redundancy,” and “Delivery.” These are issues of norms, because none of these issues are specifically addressed in the rules or have moral implications.

There were several ways that coaches worded norm issues as problems, such as: “Standards of judging,” “Examples/synthesis over analysis,” “‘Canning’ examples,” “Judge expectations (unrealistic),” “Overemphasis on delivery,” “Structure,” “Timing,” “Sub points,” “Pressure from judges not to use note cards,” “Allowing students to use the same examples over and over.” These are neither issues of rules or ethics, and they all deal with how to gain success in competition, especially the issue about judge expectations. Hence, these are norm issues.

In addition to limited preparation event problems, the most cited problems in platform speaking were also norms issues (see table 9).

**Table 9**  
Total Problems in Platform Speaking

	Students	Coaches
Rule	20	5
Norm	52	35
Ethic	10	4
Other	18	6

Examples of norm issues that students cited as problems in platform speeches were: “If you move away from the norm you get punished,” “Delivery,” “No room for deviation in topic or structure,” “Judges who rank because of good delivery only,” “The use of citations is rather limited to the same sources because you can never avoid bias,” “Lack of acceptance for experimental approaches,” “The medical/new technology topic trend that is not a trend so much as what you have to do (for success),” “Keeping the speech entertaining,” “Review/Preview,” and “Lack of competitor creativity.” These answers all address biases, stringent requirements that are not addressed by the rules, or trends. All of these are norm issues.

Examples of the norm issues that coaches saw as problems were: “Restrictions’ competitors feel as to form—structure,” “Too much emphasis is placed on quantitative, rather than qualitative, aspects of the speeches (recency of topic, number of source citations, recency of sources, etc.),” “Judges often (consciously or subconsciously) elevate the status of current or recent trends into ‘unwritten rules,’ with the effect that they judge platform speeches based not on the speech they are hearing, but on the speech they think they ought to hear,” “The annoying trend of meta-discourse in platform speeches, where topics,

jokes, or sub-points deal specifically with forensics competition. In my opinion, forensics is most useful when it is viewed as a way to learn to communicate with 'an audience,' where the audience is perhaps knowledgeable but also broad. Teaching students to communicate primarily with the forensics community is, in my opinion, both masturbatory and bad for the activity." "The same structures are used," "Unwritten topic restrictions ('what will win')," "Similarity in speeches," "Lack of energy in delivery," "Regional differences," and "Not enough humor." Like the aforementioned student answers, these coach responses address biases, non-rule requirements, and trends which categorizes them as norm issues.

In interpretation of literature events the most prevalently mentioned problems were also norms issues (see table 10).

**Table 10**  
Total Problems in Oral Interpretation of Literature

	Students	Coaches
Rule	13	5
Norm	63	45
Ethic	2	1
Other	14	7

Students cited various norm issues as problems, such as: "Norms are often mistaken for rules," "Interp of characters inconsistent," "Book work," "Gestures," "Not enough diversity," "Personal bias," "Differentiating between characters," "Consistency in voice (accents, etc.)," "Speed," and "Fads go in and out, and if you don't jump on the bandwagon, you lose. Big schools are allowed to take risks, small schools are punished for it." All of these responses address performance choices which are neither mandated by the rules nor have moral implications. Therefore, these are issues of norms.

Some of the norm issues responses that coaches gave were: "Current not as accepting of classical literature," "Unwritten rules," "Lack of defined standard criteria for judges to follow," "Students seem to be over dramatic at times," "No arguments," "Overdone scripts," "Regional differences," "Home writes," "Book tech," and "All pieces seem to lack humor." These coach responses are categorized as norm issues because they all address either what is currently acceptable and unacceptable as literature or performance choices, neither of which are dictated by the rules nor have moral impacts.

In answer to RQ4, "What kind of problems to coaches and students identify in the three genres of individual events?," the results indicate that the most frequently perceived problem in forensics is clearly norms. Pertaining to limited preparation events, 48% of the student responses and 67% of the coach response were issues of norms. Regarding platform speeches, 52% of student responses and 70% of coach responses indicated norm issues. Pertaining to interpretation of literature events, 69% of student responses and 78% of coach responses were issues of norms. Overwhelmingly, participants identified the most frequently perceived problems in forensics are issues of norms.

### Conflating Violations

The closed ended portion of the survey answers were both tabulated and compared to my answers for each item. Results were as follows. The first prompt was "An impromptu speaker reuses an example that (s)he used at the same tournament." The correct answer was norms (see table 11). There was disagreement between respondents. Most respondents misidentified this prompt as an issue of ethics or no violation. Both of those answers were circled by 39% of student participants and 30% of coaches.\

**Table 11**  
Prompt 1

	Students	Coaches
Rule	1	1
<b>Norm</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>6</b>
Ethic	17	6
No Violation	17	6

The second prompt was "An extemporaneous speaker reuses outlines that (s)he used in practice or another tournament." The correct answer was norms (see table 12). However, only 10% of the students and 15% of the coaches accurately identified this prompt as norms, while 61% of the students and 60% of the coaches identified this prompt as an issue of ethics.

**Table 12**  
Prompt 2

	Students	Coaches
Rule	6	1
<b>Norm</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>
Ethic	26	12
No Violation	4	3

The third prompt was "A competitor's persuasive speech is ending at 7:53 in competition." The correct answer was norms (see table 13). Most students thought this was an issue of rules. This prompt may have been a bit confusing, however, because the American Forensics Association (AFA) does specify 8 minutes as the minimum time. Perhaps respondents who thought this was a rule issue were a part of the AFA as well as the NFA. Only 21% of the students identified this prompt as an issue of norms, while 47% of the students identified it as an issue of rules. However, 58% of the coaches correctly identified this prompt and 32% of the coaches identified it as an issue of rules.

**Table 13**  
Prompt 3

	Students	Coaches
Rule	20	6
<b>Norm</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>11</b>
Ethic	0	0
No Violation	14	2

The fourth prompt was “A speaker is presenting a speech to entertain/after dinner speech with an informative format.” The correct answer was norms (see table 14). Most respondents correctly identified this prompt. Students are not as aware as coaches that this is a violation. In fact, 52% of the students and 40% of the coaches identified this prompt as no violation while 35% of the students and 60% of the coaches responded that this was a violation of norms. It is possible that this norm is changing. If that is the case, it would follow that students would be less likely than coaches to categorize an informative speech to entertain as a violation of any kind. This supports the notion that behaviors in forensics are learned both observationally, in rounds of competition as well as instructionally, from coaches. Perhaps coaches and students do not discuss observed competitive organizational strategies on a regular basis.

**Table 14**  
Prompt 4

	Students	Coaches
Rule	4	0
<b>Norm</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>12</b>
Ethic	1	0
No Violation	22	8

The fifth prompt was “A speaker’s communication analysis/rhetorical criticism does not address the limitations of his or her theoretical framework.” The correct answer was norms (see table 15). Of the respondents, 41% of students and 68% of coaches identified this prompt.

**Table 15**  
Prompt 5

	Students	Coaches
Rule	9	0
<b>Norm</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>13</b>
Ethic	6	2
No Violation	9	4

The sixth prompt was “An informative speaker does not address the future implications of his or her topic.” The correct answer was norms (see table 16). Almost all of the participants were able to correctly designate this prompt as an

issue of norms. More specifically, 74% of students and 75% of coaches correctly indicated what type of violation this prompt represents.

**Table 16**  
Prompt 6

	Students	Coaches
Rule	5	1
<b>Norm</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>15</b>
Ethic	2	1
No Violation	4	3

The seventh prompt was “A persuasive speech has no personal solution step.” The correct answer was norms (see table 17). The same ratio of participants agreed that this is an issue of norms as the above prompt; 74% of students and 75% of coaches.

**Table 17**  
Prompt 7

	Students	Coaches
Rule	3	0
<b>Norm</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>15</b>
Ethic	1	1
No Violation	7	4

The eighth prompt was “A competitor is presenting his or her original poetry as a poetry program and none of the poetry is published.” The correct answer was rules (see table 18). While many respondents chose rule, many chose ethic. In fact, 47% of students and 35% of coaches indicated rule, while 33% of students and 22% of coaches indicated ethic.

**Table 18**  
Prompt 8

	Students	Coaches
<b>Rule</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>8</b>
Norm	4	4
Ethic	14	5
No Violation	4	6

The ninth prompt was “A competitor is presenting his or her original poetry as a poetry program and all of the poetry is posted online.” The correct answer was norms (see table 19). Many respondents identified this prompt as an issue of ethics. There were 23% of the students and 30% of the coaches that accurately answered this prompt, while 47% of students and 35% of coaches responded that this is an issue of ethics.

**Table 19**  
Prompt 9

	Students	Coaches
Rule	7	2
<b>Norm</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>6</b>
Ethic	20	7
No Violation	6	5

The tenth prompt was “A duo team frequently looks at and touches each other throughout their piece.” The correct answer was rules (see table 20). Most students, 79%, correctly identified this prompt. However, only 40% of coaches indicated that this is a rule violation while 55% of coaches responded that this is an issue of norms.

**Table 20**  
Prompt 10

	Students	Coaches
<b>Rule</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>8</b>
Norm	8	11
Ethic	0	0
No Violation	1	1

The eleventh prompt was “A poetry program begins with an introduction and no teaser.” The correct answer was norms (see table 21). Most participants agreed: 69% of students and 75% of coaches.

**Table 21**  
Prompt 11

	Students	Coaches
Rule	4	1
<b>Norm</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>15</b>
Ethic	1	0
No Violation	8	4

The twelfth prompt was “A prose has no introduction.” The correct answer was rules (see table 22). Most students, 54%, thought that this was an issue of norms and most coaches, 65%, correctly identified this prompt as an issue of rules.

**Table 22**  
Prompt 12

	Students	Coaches
<b>Rule</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>13</b>
Norm	23	6
Ethic	0	0

No Violation	1	1
--------------	---	---

The thirteenth prompt was “A poetry program is performed all of the words of the piece posted on a visual aid with no book.” The correct answer was norms (see table 23). There were 60% of the students and 50% of the coaches incorrectly labeled this prompt as an issue of rules.

**Table 23**  
Prompt 13

	Students	Coaches
Rule	26	10
<b>Norm</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>10</b>
Ethic	2	0
No Violation	3	0

The fourteenth prompt was “A prose is performed using a pink book.” The correct answer was norms (see table 24). Most participants were able to correctly identify this prompt: 72% of students and 85% of coaches.

**Table 24**  
Prompt 14

	Students	Coaches
Rule	6	0
<b>Norm</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>17</b>
Ethic	2	0
No Violation	4	3

The fifteenth prompt was “A persuasive is done on a question of value, not policy.” The correct answer was norms (see table 25). Of the respondents, 52% of students and 60% of coaches identified this prompt as an issue of norms, while 33% of students and 35% of coaches identified it as no violation.

**Table 25**  
Prompt 15

	Students	Coaches
Rule	2	0
<b>Norm</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>12</b>
Ethic	4	1
No Violation	14	7

The sixteenth prompt was “A competitor’s persuasive speech is ending at 10:07 in competition.” The correct answer was rules (see table 26). An overwhelming majority of the respondents, 74% of students and 95% of coaches, were able to correctly label this issue.

**Table 26**  
Prompt 16

	Students	Coaches
<b>Rule</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>19</b>
Norm	7	1
Ethic	0	0
No Violation	4	0

In answer to RQ5, “Do coaches and students conflate the concepts of rules, norms, and ethics?” the data suggests that sometimes they do and sometimes they do not. The cases of norms in which there was the most disagreement are probably the most controversial issues, and should be specifically addressed by the rules or code of ethics.

For example, the prompt involving extemporaneous speaking (see table 11) was nearly an even split between those participants who indicated re-using outlines is no violation and those who indicated that it is a violation of ethics. This indicates that the forensics community is split to extremes of ethics or no violation on this issue. This is not an issue addressed in the NFA rules or code of ethics.

Additionally, a majority of the respondents indicated that reusing examples in impromptu (see table 12) is an ethical violation. This is another issue that is not addressed by the NFA rules or code of ethics. Most of the norms issues that dealt with structure of speeches were correctly identified by participants. However, the majority of students and over half of coaches think of “home-writes” as unethical.

Students, as well as coaches, do not recognize that an introduction is required by the rules in interpretation events (see table 22). They do, however, recognize that an introduction is at least expected. The majority of coaches and students think that a book is required by the rules in interpretation events, but fewer think that black books are required. This may be because books have been the norm in these events for so long.

Overall, the disagreement on what concept is being violated pertains to authorship. Whether it is conflict over when an extemporaneous outline was created, whether an impromptu example has been used before, or if a competitor wrote their own interpretation piece, the issue of authorship is controversial. Perhaps coaches attempt to teach fairness and these issues are perceived as unfair.

Additionally, the agreed upon norms seem to all be issues of structure. These issues have to do with how to organize a platform speech and how to present an interpretation of literature piece. These may be the oldest and most accepted norms.

In this section of the questionnaire, many coaches and students answered the prompts correctly. The prompts that they agreed on the most were issues of norms. There were a few prompts that most of the participants answered incorrectly. In these instances, it seems that students and coaches alike are mistaking norms for rules. For example the third prompt, “A competitor’s

persuasive speech is ending at 7:53 in competition,” was mostly identified as a rule violation rather than a norm violation by the participants (see table 13). Additionally, the thirteenth prompt, “A poetry program is performed with all of the words of the piece posted on a visual aid with no book,” was mostly identified as an issue of rules, when it is not addressed by the rules in actuality (see table 23).

In other cases, the coaches and students seemed to be mistaking norms for ethics. For instance, the second prompt, “An extemporaneous speaker reuses outlines that (s)he used in practice or another tournament,” was overwhelmingly labeled as an issue of ethics, when it is actually an issue of norms (see table 12). Additionally, the ninth prompt, “A competitor is presenting his or her original poetry as a poetry program and all of the poetry is posted online,” was identified as an ethical issue rather than what it is; an issue of norms (see table 19).

The results of the survey warrant three specific conclusions: 1) Norms are the most emphasized issue in forensics, 2) coaches are not concerned with the NFA rules and code of ethics (they do not seem to like the top down approach), and 3) coaches are more concerned with winning than they explicitly claim to be. These conclusions are supported by that data in many ways. First, the data indicates that norms are the most emphasized issue in forensics. The second conclusion was that coaches do not seem to be concerned with the NFA rules and code of ethics. The third conclusion was that coaches are more concerned with winning than they, or their students, explicitly claim that they are.

The results indicate that coaches and students emphasize norms over rules or ethics, prefer a customized ethical code for their own team, and emphasize the competitive aspect of forensics to each other more than they like to express to others. Perhaps ethics has been an over-stressed concept in forensics literature in the past.

### Impacts

The impact of this analysis is fivefold and lies within how the data answers the RQs. To begin, in response to RQ1, “What reasons do coaches give for being involved in forensics? Can their students accurately identify why they are involved?” most coaches claimed to be involved in forensics for enjoyment, and the majority of students thought this was why their coach was involved. It seems, based on this data set, that coaches have a deep passion for forensics and continue to participate in order to pass this passion on to their students. Students seem to understand that their coach is passionate about forensics, and enjoyment keeps the coach involved. This finding indicates that coaches are interested in fostering a passion and personal growth in their students. The passion that coaches pass on to the students likely keeps the activity alive form year to year. It is logical that coaches would have such a passion for forensics, because forensic teams operate like families most of the time, and the time commitment is enormous.

Second, in response to RQ2, “What concepts do coaches teach in forensics? Can their students accurately identify these concepts?” coaches were somewhat split on their answers to what the most important concept they teach is. The

most frequent response, however, by coaches and students was “do your best in competition.” This seems incongruent with being involved for enjoyment. Though it may be fun to win, the heart of these answers seemed to be focused on the end result as a goal to be attained, with no mention of enjoyment. Forensics is a competitive activity, obviously. However, it seems that coaches do not like to come right out and say that the competition is why they are involved. This is probably due to the fact that most coaches must spend a significant amount of time justifying to outsiders (i.e., administrators, students, other professors, etc.) why forensics is worthwhile beyond competition. Forensics coaches may be trained, inadvertently, to justify their programs with anything other than competition. There may be some institutions that find a winning record to be enough to justify a program. However, there are very few programs that have enough competitive success for winning to be enough justification. Furthermore, most of the schools represented in my sample are not highly competitively successful schools.

Third, in answer to RQ3, “Which of these three concepts—rules, norms, and ethics—is the most emphasized by coaches and students in intercollegiate forensics?” the answer to this question is clearly norms. The most frequently mentioned significant problems with events in competition (section 3) were issues of norms. In response to section 4, students and coaches tended to circle norms as the response to what type of violation it was for most of the prompts that actually dealt with norms; especially those prompts that dealt with the organization of a speech. Students’ and coaches’ responses to the prompts that were in agreement were most frequently norms. These seem to be the most valued, most talked about, and most clearly understood violations in forensics. This finding is supported by existing literature that explored norms and unwritten rules in forensics (i.e., Cronn-Mills, 2000, Cronn-Mills and Golden, 1997, Endres, 1988, Kuster, 1998, Lewis, 1988, Pratt, 1998, Rice and Mummert, 2001, Rosenthal, 1985, and VerLinden, 1997). This over-emphasis on norms indicates that forensics truly is a culture, in which the participants learn that it is more important that others within the culture accept their behaviors than to operate within written rules or ethical codes.

The data also indicates that coaches and students alike prefer contextual and situational ethics over universal, organizationally imposed ethics. Existing literature would indicate that coaches and students strongly value the NFA rules and code of ethics. Many scholars argue in favor of stringent national standards for rules and ethics (ie., Cronn-Mills, 2000; Frank, 1983; Friedley 1983; Kay & Aden). The participants in this study, however, signify otherwise. The responses to the questionnaires indicate that students and coaches do not often discuss the NFA rules and code of ethics. This may mean that coaches feel that they know the needs of their team better than the NFA does. Coaches seem to value ethics, but not imposed, universal ethics. Students seem to learn best through observation. Further, students and coaches appear to have a close relational bond overall. Students expressed a great love and trust for their coaches’ judgment. They seemed to assume that their coach knows what is best. This could be a sign of good coaching because of the closeness of their relationships.

This could also be an indication that coaches find the NFA rules and code of ethics (last updated in 1991) to be irrelevant. Perhaps the closeness between coaches and students fosters the understanding and trust necessary for coaches to assess what the best set of standards would be for their competitors.

Fourth, in response to RQ4, “What kind of problems do coaches and students identify in the three genres of individual events?,” the answer is, as above, clearly norms. Forensics is simultaneously a competitive and performance-based activity. The results led me to conclude that behaviors are learned primarily through observation rather than reading guidelines or being lectured. The most agreed upon responses in this study involved the concept of forensic norms. It seems that coaches and students alike are most concerned with norms and behavior that fits situation. Forensics is clearly a culture which is valued by its participants. Students and coaches alike seem very aware of the expectations (or norms) within the culture. This seems to support why they enjoy forensics; because it is understood by and comfortable to the participants. Especially because the most important coaches teach their students is usually to “do your best in competition,” it follows that students and coaches would be inclined to push the boundaries of rules and ethics, if necessary in order to follow forensic norms that garner competitive success.

Perhaps these are the most interesting results of this study, because the most frequently addressed concept was norms. The norms that were most frequently labeled as rules by the participant probably constitute the most talked about norms, and inherently, accepted as rules, though not recorded as such. The cultural expectations involved in forensics seem to be the most often discussed and best understood. While many participants expressed a frustration with how stringent the norms in forensics are, they also seemed to understand what those norms were. This finding supports the work of Cronn-Mills and Golden (1997) and VerLinden (1997). These authors stated that in order to see competitive success it is essential for students to understand the norms or unwritten rules in forensics. The results indicate that most competitors and coaches alike do understand forensics norms or unwritten rules.

Fifth, in response to RQ5, “Do coaches and students conflate the concepts of rules, norms, and ethics?,” the answer is frequently they do, which may or may not matter. If as scholars of communication scholars or participants in the forensic community are concerned with theory, we need these conceptual distinctions. However, perhaps, in the end, on a pragmatic level, it does not matter that there is no consistent semantic distinction between rules, norms, and ethics. It may, in fact, matter most that competitors understand that there are consequences to their actions in forensics. Suffice it to say, it may be more important that students understand that they are committing a violation in general, rather than understanding precisely, on a theoretical level, what type of violation it is that they are committing. The NFA rules and code of ethics are currently confusing and, according to my sample, irrelevant. If the NFA believes that the aforementioned theoretical distinction is important or any national regulations, for that matter, then they should engage in the following actions:

- Regularly survey coaches and students about their opinions on requirements and behaviors at tournaments.
- Hold bi-annual regional meetings, not just annual, national meetings, that actually revise the rules and code of ethics that involve voices of coaches and competitors alike. (The NFA code of ethics was last updated in 1991.)
- Based on these regional recommendations and survey results, the NFA should issue judging guidelines required to be distributed at all invitational tournaments.
- These guidelines should be distributed to teams and define specifically which actions should be rewarded in rounds and which actions should be punished.
- Coaches that are concerned with the conceptual distinctions ought to urge the NFA to engage in the aforementioned actions and discuss the NFA rules and code of ethics with their competitors.
- Coaches and students that reject national standards ought to voice their opinion against the NFA.
- Students need to ask their coaches about the requirements of competition; whether it be on a theoretical or pragmatic level.

### Limitations

While this study provided significant, applicable results, it also has a number of limitations, including: administration, the survey itself, and potential unforeseen biases from researcher influence. Administratively speaking, the distribution of this survey was a bit flawed. Sample size was a limitation in this study. I handed out a total of 240 hard copies of the survey as well as posted the survey to the Individual Event Listserv, Net Benefits (a parliamentary debate forum), and emailed the survey directly to all of the coaches who were registered for the NFA electronic newsletter. However, only 3 surveys were returned by email. The rest of the surveys were returned in person, to me at one of the three tournaments in which I handed them out; the 35<sup>th</sup> Annual Age of Aquarius Forensics Invitational at Ball State University, the 57<sup>th</sup> annual L. E. Norton Forensics Invitational at Bradley University, or the 3<sup>rd</sup> Annual SCUDL Swing at California State University Fullerton.

The questions asked, may not have been as effective, as originally anticipated. For example, they could have either been more specific or more open-ended. This would have increased the possibility of getting answers that would have more directly answered my RQs or at least given my participants more room to answer as candidly as they wanted to answer. One coach responded after the entirety of section 3 (problems with events in competition):

I think there is a problem with young coaches/judges that have an observational knowledge of forensics (they know about CA or Duo because they have seen CA or Duo not because they have studied Rhetorical Theory or have a background in Oral Interp[retation] Theory or Performance Studies) and lay down mandates on ballots that are not consistent with the pedagogy in the field, and that crosses all three genres.

This suggests that perhaps the violations being broken up by genre without an overall section may not have been the most effective choice. Additionally, regarding section 4, the rules I refer to are labeled as event descriptions. Therefore, many coaches may reject the notion that there are any rules in forensics at all.

Finally, in terms of researcher influence on my participants, something interesting arose from my data set. Because I was a competitor a mere two years ago and attended five national tournaments, over three consecutive seasons, in 4-7 events at each, it is possible that I inadvertently influenced some of my respondents. For example, one student wrote in response to: A prose is performed using a pink book. “You mean your POI!!! Norms, you rebel. Violating all those poor guys named Norm.” I did, in fact, compete with a programmed oral interpretation my last year of competition using a pink book. This may have influenced some of my respondents.

### Suggestions for Future Research

This experience has led me to the conclusion that if I were to repeat this study, I would do three things differently. I would alter my method of distribution, further explore the idea of violation, and revamp my survey. In order to increase sample size and variety, I would distribute a survey at a variety of tournaments throughout multiple seasons. Perhaps distributing the survey at a state, regional, or national championship would yield more participants. Also, for every tournament at which I distributed my survey, I was also either helping to administrate the tournament or judging every round. Perhaps if all I had to do was obtain responses to my survey, I could keep track of the schools represented by respondents and ensure more of a variety of schools to be represented. Also, I could make sure that I have students and coaches that represent every school in my study.

In a future study, I would further explore the idea of violation. The perceived versus actual consequences to different violations would be interesting to explore. Forensics literature adequately examine the theoretical distinctions between a rule, norm, and ethical violation. However, on a pragmatic level, it appears that the violation has more impact on the coach and the competitor than what type of violation it is. In support of this notion, one coach wrote on the back of his or her survey. “I think most of these examples are unwritten rules or norms . . . We need events that will let us take risks and explore literature.”

Another coach’s critique of the survey supports the need for these definitions. Addressing the directions for section 4 he or she wrote,

The directions seem to combine a question of fact with a question of opinion, however. For example, for the third statement, I know that it is not a violation of rules {fact} and I know that many judges think that it is, which makes it a norm whether I agree or not. In my opinion, it is not a violation of anything, however—so I must choose between my opinion about the

statement itself and my opinion about other people's opinions. I'm not sure which is more important for your research. But I do like the statements you have come up with.

This coach made an excellent point. Never in the directions, do I explain whether the participant should circle which kind of violation it should be or what kind of violation it is for the majority of the community, or what kind of violation it is to the NFA. This type of ambiguity is what I identified as a problem to begin with. I would reword the directions to instruct the participants to delineate their answers in some way.

### Conclusion

In today's world of intercollegiate forensics, there may never be complete agreement on rules, norms, and ethics. However, it does seem that coaches and students communicate well with each other and have a great understanding and trust for one another. The coach-student relationship is one that is very close, and the closer the relationship between these roles, it seems that the more understanding can be gained. Hopefully, scholars will continue to pursue this area for future research, especially regarding these relationships and the idea of violation.

### Appendix A

#### NFA Code of Ethics

(Revised 1991)

*Please note: The constitution and the bylaws can be found separately on the website.*

#### 1. Repetition of Materials (In Prepared & Interpretive Events)

Basic Rule: It is unethical for students to reuse materials from year to year.

#### 2. Literary Definitions for Interpretive Events

Basic Rule: Contestants must use literary selections in the appropriate event category and must perform those selections in English

#### 3. Authorship of Materials Used in Competition

Basic Rule: Students should author their own materials in non-interpretative events and should cite sources for any materials they employ which are not original.

#### 4. Time Limits

Basic Rule: The judge(s) in each round must assure accurate timing of all performances and provision of accurate time signals in limited preparation events.

#### 5. Student Affiliation with an Institution

Basic Rule: Students who attend more than one college may only represent one College at nationals. Students may compete at nationals only in those events they qualified while representing the school they compete for at nationals. Students who officially transfer from one institution to another may compete in any events for which they have qualified.

#### 6. Student Status

Basic Rule: Students who compete at nationals must be making progress toward an initial undergraduate degree.

#### 7. Evidence in Debate

Basic Rule: Students should only use evidence that is accurate and thoroughly referenced

#### 8. Non-published Evidence in All Events

Basic Rule: Students may use evidence from non-written sources as long as the veracity of the evidence may be verified.

#### 9. Ethical Judging Behavior

Basic Rule: Judges should act professionally, with a respect for academic freedom, when engaged in the practice of critiquing and rating students.

Retrieved August 13, 2004 from:

<http://www.bethel.edu/Majors/Communication/nfa/codeethics.pdf>

### Appendix C

#### Questionnaires

#### Questionnaire (for coaches)

##### Section One: Demographic Information

I am a director of forensics/assistant coach (please circle one)

from \_\_\_\_\_ (name of school)

I am the primary coach for: (please circle all that apply)

interpretation of literature/ platform speeches/ limited preparation/ debate

##### Section Two: Your goals and philosophy

1. Why are you involved in forensics?
2. Why is this activity important to you?
3. What is the most important concept you teach your competitors?
4. What is the most challenging aspect in achieving competitive success? Why?
5. What is the most challenging aspect in achieving educational goals? Why?
6. What do you know about the NFA rules and code of ethics?
7. How do you refer to the code of ethics when coaching your students?

##### Section Three: Events in Competition

1. In limited preparation events, what are the 3 most significant problems in competition? (Please rank them from most to least.)
2. In platform events, what are the 3 most significant problems in competition? (Please rank them from most to least.)
3. In interpretation of literature events, what are the 3 most significant problems in competition? (Please rank them from most to least.)

Section Four: Circle whether this is primarily a violation of rules, norms, ethics, or no violation.

<i>Speaker &amp; Gavel 2006</i>				81
An impromptu speaker reuses an example that (s)he used at the same tournament.	Rules	Norms	Ethics	No Violation
An extemporaneous speaker reuses outlines that (s)he used in practice or another tournament.	Rules	Norms	Ethics	No Violation
A competitor's persuasive speech is ending at 7:53 in competition.	Rules	Norms	Ethics	No Violation
A speaker is presenting a speech to entertain/after dinner speech with an informative format.	Rules	Norms	Ethics	No Violation
A speaker's communication analysis/rhetorical criticism does not address the limitations of his or her theoretical framework.	Rules	Norms	Ethics	No Violation
An informative speaker does not address the future implications of his or her topic.	Rules	Norms	Ethics	No Violation
A persuasive speech has no personal solution step.	Rules	Norms	Ethics	No Violation
A competitor is presenting his or her original poetry as a poetry program and none of the poetry is published.	Rules	Norms	Ethics	No Violation
A competitor is presenting his or her original poetry as a poetry program and all of the poetry is posted online.	Rules	Norms	Ethics	No Violation
A duo team frequently looks at and touches each other throughout their piece.	Rules	Norms	Ethics	No Violation
A poetry program begins with an introduction and no teaser.	Rules	Norms	Ethics	No Violation
A prose has no introduction.	Rules	Norms	Ethics	No Violation
A poetry program is performed all of the words of the piece posted on a visual aid with no book.	Rules	Norms	Ethics	No Violation
A prose is performed using a pink book.	Rules	Norms	Ethics	No Violation
A persuasive is done on a question of value, not policy.	Rules	Norms	Ethics	No Violation

Speaker and Gavel, Vol 43 (2006)

[www.dsr-tka.org/](http://www.dsr-tka.org/)

<i>Speaker &amp; Gavel 2006</i>					
A competitor's persuasive speech is ending at 10:07 in competition.	Rules	Norms	Ethics	No Violation	
<b>Questionnaire (for students)</b>					
Section One: Demographic Information					
I am a freshman/sophomore/junior/senior (please circle one) from _____ (name of school)					
a four/two-year college/university (please circle one)					
I participate in the following events (please circle all that apply): interpretation of literature/ platform speeches/ limited preparation/ debate					
Section Two: Your Coach's Goals and Philosophy					
1. Why is your coach involved in forensics?					
2. Why is this activity important to your coach?					
3. What is the most important concept your coach teaches your team?					
4. What is the most challenging aspect in achieving competitive success? Why?					
5. What is the most challenging aspect in achieving educational goals? Why?					
6. What do you coach know about the NFA rules and code of ethics?					
7. How does your coach refer to the code of ethics when coaching your team?					
Section Three: Events in Competition					
1. In limited preparation events, what are the 3 most significant problems in competition? (Please rank them from most to least.)					
2. In platform events, what are the 3 most significant problems in competition? (Please rank them from most to least.)					
3. In interpretation of literature events, what are the 3 most significant problems in competition? (Please rank them from most to least.)					
Section Four: Circle whether this is primarily a violation of rules, norms, ethics, or no violation.					
An impromptu speaker reuses an example that (s)he used at the same tournament.	Rules	Norms	Ethics	No Violation	
An extemporaneous speaker reuses outlines that (s)he used in practice or another tournament.	Rules	Norms	Ethics	No Violation	
A competitor's persuasive speech is ending at 7:53 in competition.	Rules	Norms	Ethics	No Violation	
A speaker is presenting a speech to entertain/after dinner speech with an informative format.	Rules	Norms	Ethics	No Violation	

Speaker and Gavel, Vol 43 (2006)

[www.dsr-tka.org/](http://www.dsr-tka.org/)

Speaker & Gavel 2006	83
A speaker's communication analysis/rhetorical criticism does not address the limitations of his or her theoretical framework.	No Violation
An informative speaker does not address the future implications of his or her topic.	No Violation
A persuasive speech has no personal solution step.	No Violation
A competitor is presenting his or her original poetry as a poetry program and none of the poetry is published.	No Violation
A competitor is presenting his or her original poetry as a poetry program and all of the poetry is posted online.	No Violation
A duo team frequently looks at and touches each other throughout their piece.	No Violation
A poetry program begins with an introduction and no teaser.	No Violation
A prose has no introduction.	No Violation
A poetry program is performed all of the words of the piece posted on a visual aid with no book.	No Violation
A prose is performed using a pink book.	No Violation
A persuasive is done on a question of value, not policy.	No Violation
A competitor's persuasive speech is ending at 10:07 in competition.	No Violation

**References**

Anderson, T. M. (1989). "According to . . .": Toward standards for the ethical use of evidence in individual events. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association. San Francisco, CA.

Bok, S. (1978). *Lying: Moral choice in public and private life*. New York, NY: Vintage Books.

Christians, C., & Traber, M. (1997). *Communication ethics and universal truths*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Speaker & Gavel 2006	84
Cronn-Mills, D. (2000). Interpretation, ethics, and education: An analysis of the AFA-NIET "Ethical use of literature policy." <i>Speaker and Gavel</i> , 37(1), 61-65.	
Cronn-Mills, D., & Golden, A. (1997). The unwritten rules of oral interpretation. <i>Speaker Points</i> . 4(2). Retrieved November 1, 2003, from <a href="http://www.phirhopi.org/prp/spkrpts4.2/rice.html">http://www.phirhopi.org/prp/spkrpts4.2/rice.html</a>	
de Beauvoir, S. (1948). <i>Ethics of ambiguity</i> . New York, NY: Philosophical Library.	
Derryberry, B. R. (1991). The nature of the "Total" forensic program: The 1990s and beyond. <i>National Forensic Journal</i> , 9, 19-29.	
Endres, T. G. (1988). Maintaining integrity in forensic interpretation: Arguments against original literature. <i>National Forensic Journal</i> , 6(2), 103-112.	
Ford, S. D., & Green, K. D. (1987). Perceived attitudes toward the use of original material in forensics oral interpretation: A survey. Presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Boston, MA.	
Frank, R. L. (1983). The abuse of evidence in persuasive speaking. <i>National Forensic Journal</i> . 1(2), 97-107.	
Friedley, S. (1983). Ethics and evidence usage: Current codes in individual events. <i>National Forensic Journal</i> , 1(2), 109-117.	
Fryar, M. (1981). Coaching for individual events. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Southern Communication Association. Austin, TX.	
Gaskill, R. (1998). Bad taste: Nothing should be done: Celebrating diversity. <i>Speaker Points</i> . 5(2). Retrieved November 1, 2003, from <a href="http://www.phirhopi.org/prp/spkrpts5.2/gaskill.htm">http://www.phirhopi.org/prp/spkrpts5.2/gaskill.htm</a>	
Green, K. D. (1988). Original material in forensic oral interpretation: A violation of integrity. <i>National Forensic Journal</i> , 21(1), 69-72.	
Greenstreet, R.W. (1990). Public address events: Maximizing educational value. Paper presented at the annual convention of the Speech Communication Association. Denver, CO.	
Grisez, G. G. (1965). The concept of appropriateness: Ethical considerations in persuasive argument. <i>Argumentation &amp; Advocacy/Journal of the American Forensic Association</i> . 2(2), 53-58.	
Habermas, J. (1989). <i>Jurgen Habermas on society and politics</i> . Boston, MA: Beacon Press.	
Hamm, D. D. (1993). Forensics in the year 2000: Competition versus educational values. Paper presented at the convention of the Central / Southern States Communication Association.	
Hanson, C. T. (1986). Competing in host school tournaments. <i>The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta</i> . 71(3), 61-65.	
Jenson, J. V. (1997). <i>Ethical issues in the communication process</i> . Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.	
Johannesen, R. L. (1997). <i>Ethics in human communication</i> (4 <sup>th</sup> ed.). Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.	
Kalanquin, P. (1989). Have we been offering too much help? In L. Schnoor & V. Karns (Eds.), <i>Perspective on individual events: Proceedings of the first</i>	

- developmental conference on individual events (pp. 90-93). Mankato, MN: Mankato State.
- King, M. L. (1963). Letter from a Birmingham jail. New York, NY: Harper-Collins Publishers.
- Kuster, T. (1998). Locating and defining problems of bad taste in college forensics. *Speaker Points*, 5(2). Retrieved November 1, 2003, from <http://www.phirhopi.org/prp/spkrpts5.2/kuster.htm>
- Lewis, T. V. (1988). The performance of literature at forensic tournaments: A case for the use of original material. *National Forensic Journal*, 6(1), 63-67.
- Madsen, S. (1984). Ethical considerations in building a forensics program. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Central States Speech Association. Chicago, IL.
- NFA code of ethics. (1991). Retrieved November 1, 2003, from <http://www.bethel.edu/Majors/Communication/nfa/codeethics.pdf>
- NFA individual events rules. (2000). Retrieved December 3, 2003, from <http://www.bethel.edu/college/dept/comm/nfa/ierules.html>
- Nilsen, T. R. (1966). Ethics of speech communication. Indianapolis, IN: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc.
- Pratt, J. W. (1998). Bad taste: Something should be done. *Speaker Points*, 5(2). Retrieved November 1, 2003, from <http://www.phirhopi.org/prp/spkrpts5.2/pratt.htm>
- Rawls, J. (1999). A Theory of justice (Revised Edition). Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Rice, J., & Mummert, J. (2001). Perceptions of event lines: Do they exist? *Speaker Points*, 8(1). Retrieved November 1, 2003, from <http://www.phirhopi.org/prp/spkrpts8.1/rice.pdf>
- Reynolds, C. L. (1991). Formula vs. fractured formula in contest persuasive speaking. Paper presented at the 77<sup>th</sup> annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association. Atlanta, GA.
- Samosky, J. A., & Baird, J. E. (1982). Persuasion vs. oratory: Is it time to resurrect the speech to stimulate? Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Western Speech Communication Association. Denver, CO.
- Sanders, K. R. (1966). Toward a solution to the misuse of evidence. *Argumentation & Advocacy/Journal of the American Forensic Association*, 3(1), 6-10.
- Shimanoff, S. B. (1980). *Communication rules: Theory and research*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Library of Social Research.
- Stewart, D. J. (1986). A standard of ethics for argument. *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta*, 71(3), 53-60.
- Thomas, D. A. (1983). The ethics of proof in speech events: A survey of standards used by contestants and judges. *National Forensic Journal*, 1(1), 1-18.
- Thomas, D. A., & Hart, J. (1983). Ethics in speech events: A replication and extension. *National Forensic Journal*, 1(2), 74-95.
- Ulrich, W. (1984). The ethics of forensics: An overview. In Parson, D (Ed.), *American Forensics in Perspective* (pp. 13-22). Annandale, VA: SCA

- VerLinden, J. (1997). The unwritten rules in public address. *Speaker Points*, 4(2). Retrieved November 1, 2003, from <http://www.phirhopi.org/prp/spkrpts4.2/verl.html>
- Weaver, R. M. (1985). Ethics of rhetoric. Davis, CA: Hermagoras Press.

Author's Note: This article is adapted from a master's thesis completed at Ball State University.

The author wishes to thank her thesis committee: Dr. Jon Rutter, Dr. Glenn Stamp, and Mr. Mike Bauer, all of Ball State University. The author also extends a thank you to her undergraduate academic mentor, Dr. Marc T. Newman of Palomar College for introducing her to communication studies as a field and to forensics.

Crystal-Lane Swift is a doctoral student and the director of the forensics team at Louisiana State University.