

January 2006

Complete Volume (43)

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

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

Recommended Citation

(2006). Complete Volume (43). *Speaker & Gavel*, 43, 1-86.

This Complete Issue 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.

Speaker & Gavel

Volume 43/2006

An Examination of Students Perceptions of “Learning” in a Study Abroad Experience and Recommendations for Effective Pedagogy

Scott Dickmeyer
Ronda Knox

A Functional Analysis of Non-Presidential Primary Debates

William L. Benoit
Jayne Henson

The Small-College Communication Program: An Assessment of Communication Program Organization and Curricula at Private Liberal Arts Colleges in the Midwest and South

Brian R. McGee
Deborah Socha McGee

Conflating Rules, Norms, and Ethics in Intercollegiate Forensics

Crystal Lane Swift

Journal of
DELTA SIGMA RHO—TAU KAPPA ALPHA
www.dsr-tka.org/

Speaker & Gavel

Delta Sigma Rho—Tau Kappa Alpha
National Honorary Forensic Society
www.dsr-tka.org/

EDITORIAL STAFF

Editor Daniel Cronn-Mills
Minnesota State University, Mankato
daniel.cronn-mills@mnsu.edu

Office Kathy Steiner

Speaker & Gavel

<http://www.dsr-tka.org/> Volume 43 / 2006

Table of Contents

An Examination of Students Perceptions of “Learning” in a Study Abroad Experience and Recommendations for Effective Pedagogy Scott Dickmeyer Ronda Knox	1
A Functional Analysis of Non-Presidential Primary Debates William L. Benoit Jayne Henson	22
The Small-College Communication Program: An Assessment of Communication Program Organization and Curricula at Private Liberal Arts Colleges in the Midwest and South Brian R. McGee Deborah Socha McGee	36
Conflating Rules, Norms, and Ethics in Intercollegiate Forensics Crystal Lane Swift	46

Editor’s Note:

S&G went to an entire online format with volume 41/2004 of the journal. The journal will be available online at: www.dsr-tka.org/ The layout and design of the journal will not change in the online format. The journal will be available online as a pdf document. A pdf document is identical to a traditional hardcopy journal. We hope enjoy and utilize the new format.

Speaker and Gavel, Vol 43 (2006)

www.dsr-tka.org/

Speaker and Gavel, Vol 43 (2006)

www.dsr-tka.org/

Speaker & Gavel

**Delta Sigma Rho—Tau Kappa Alpha
National Honorary Forensic Society**

www.dsr-tka.org/

Editor

Daniel Cronn-Mills
230 Armstrong Hall
Minnesota State University
Mankato, MN 56001
507.389.2213
daniel.cronn-mills@mnsu.edu

Editorial Board

Susan J. Balthier, DePauw U
Jon Bruschke, CSU, Fullerton
Ann Burnett, North Dakota State U
James Dittus, Highland CC
Lisa Flores, Arizona State U
David Gaer, Laramie County CC
JanieM. Harden Fritz, Duquesne U
Karla Leeper, Baylor U
Allan Loudon, Wake Forest U
Mark Meister, North Dakota State U
Edward Panetta, U of Georgia
Jeff Pierson, Bridgewater C
Kimberely Powell, Luther C
David Williams, Texas Tech U

Submission Guidelines

S&G publishes refereed articles addressing all aspects of communication theory and practice. Authors should submit three copies of their manuscript prepared according to the latest edition of MLA or APA guidelines. Use minimal endnotes only for exposition or explanation, not as bibliographic citations. Include a cover letter identifying author(s) and affiliation(s). Remove all references in the manuscript to author and affiliation to facilitate blind review. S&G encourages and promotes undergraduate and graduate research. Submissions from undergraduate and graduate students should be identified as such on the cover letter. Enclose a computer disk with an accurate copy of your manuscript. Clearly label the the disk with OS platform (e.g., Macintosh, Windows) and word processing software.

An Examination of Students Perceptions of “Learning” in a Study Abroad Experience and Recommendations for Effective Pedagogy

Scott Dickmeyer
Ronda Knox

Abstract

Undergraduate study abroad programs are becoming more popular in our increasingly global society. Students consider the opportunity to study abroad to be a personally impacting educational experience. This study provided empirical data demonstrating that study abroad experiences are unique as students learn in ways that differ from the tradition classroom. Additionally, the results indicate that students struggle with the interdependent terms study and abroad. The experience of living abroad is exceptionally educational as well deeply personal and impacting. However, traditional classroom study practices (reading textbooks, taking exams, etc.) impose obstacles for the experiential learning (living in another culture). As such, more instructional communication scholarship is needed to understand the unique pedagogical act of studying abroad. Ultimately, this research posits that creative pedagogy may provide students a more educational and impacting study abroad experience.

Introduction

Ireland has put a new meaning into learning. Being a student here has put me in a mode where I always want to be learning. From traveling to meeting people, I have learned more that any book could ever convey.

Jenny (fictional name)

One of the most unique and personally impacting collegiate educational experiences occurs when one studies abroad. Studying abroad is important as we live in an age of globalization where international borders are no longer boundaries and students must be prepared to navigate our multicultural world. The justification for studying abroad is obvious—it is the only curriculum that makes perfect sense (Marcum & Roochnick, 2001). It is not surprising that students are taking advantage of study abroad opportunities. In fact, the number of students studying abroad tripled during the later part of the 21st century (Marklein, 2003). The Institute of International Education reports that over 154,000 U.S. college students studied abroad during the 2000-2001 academic year (Witherell, 2002). While more students are taking advantage of the study abroad experience, instructional communication scholars have yet to consider this unique pedagogical phenomenon a significant topic for research.

Dixon-Shaver and Shaver (1995) demonstrate the intersubjective nature of communication and culture claiming, the “production, maintenance, and interpretation of culture is communication and communication is culture” (p. 2).

Speaker and Gavel, Vol 43 (2006)

www.dsr-tka.org/

While instructors can profess that culture and communication are interconnected and co-constituted phenomena, students need direct experience to truly understand the phenomenon. However, providing a structured learning experience calls for effective pedagogical decisions by instructors, many of whom have not taught abroad and are unaware of the impact of study-abroad experiences. The best way to understand the impact of *study* (knowledge acquisition) *abroad* (in a new culture) *experiences* (while facing new opportunities and challenges) is an empirical investigation of actual student perceptions while studying abroad.

Review of Literature

The study abroad experience is a unique and impacting educational occurrence as a student’s experience involves immersion in another culture. The immersion experience is different than the traditional lecture/discussion format student’s experience in American universities. The impact of an immersion-based educational experience should be understood through an instructional communication perspective.

Instructional communication has been examined from a variety of perspectives that demonstrate the phenomenon of pedagogy in American classrooms. Numerous variables have been studied in communication education. Some examples of teacher behaviors include, affinity seeking (Frymier, 1994; Frymier & Thompspon, 1992; Gorham, Kelley, & McCroskey, 1989), teacher clarity (Chesebro & McCroskey, 2001; Chesebro & McCroskey, 1998), immediacy behaviors (Christophel, 1990; Gorham, 1988; Richmond, 1990), dress (Gorham, Stanely, & Morris, 1999) and verbal aggression (Myers & Knox, 2000; Myers & Knox, 1999).

Student motivation (Dobos, 1996; Kerssen-Griep, 2001; Myers, 2002; Schrodt, Wheelless, & Ptacek, 2000) and student learning (Teven & McCroskey, 1997; Christensen & Menzel, 1998; Wanzer & Frymier, 1999) have also been extensively examined. Two other areas of instructional communication that have received recent attention are computer-mediated communication in the classroom (Lane & Shelton, 2001; LaRose & Whitten, 2000) and the scholarship of teaching and learning (McCroskey, Richmond, & McCroskey, 2002). However, very few communication scholars have examined teaching and learning in a study abroad experience. The following review will examine literature on study abroad and experiential learning.

Study Abroad

Scant attention has been given to study abroad from a communication perspective. Martin (1989) developed a pre-departure course for students to learn skills to be successful while studying abroad. She argued the course should be similar to other skills-type communication courses, such as public speaking and small group communication. The goal of a pre-departure orientation is to help students prepare for their intercultural experience. Martin (1989) posited that mainstream academic courses do not prepare students to be successful in a new cultural environment. She argued that realistic expectations would help students become more successful while studying abroad. Martin’s (1989) proposal for a

Speaker and Gavel, Vol 43 (2006)

www.dsr-tka.org/

pre-departure course included suggestions for course content. Two of the objectives for the course are uniquely communicative in nature, “first, to give students a conceptual framework for understanding intercultural interactions; second, to assist in developing strategies for effective intercultural adjustment and interaction” (Martin, 1989, p. 250).

A reentry course has also been proposed from an intercultural communication perspective (Koester, 1984). The purpose of this course was to have students examine their experiences upon their return from studying abroad. Course objectives included: “to study the interpersonal communication process during the intercultural reentry” and “to understand the impact of the intercultural experience on interpersonal communication” (Koester, 1984, p. 253). Martin (1986) also studied the role of communication in students’ reentry into the United States. She contends that teachers need to examine students’ study abroad experiences from a communication perspective. Martin (1986) found that study abroad students perceived positive and negative changes in their relationships with their parents, siblings, and friends when they returned from their study abroad experience. This review of instructional communication research shows that the need for more currently and basic research that focuses on students’ lived-experience of studying abroad.

While there is little research from an instructional communication perspective, study abroad scholarship generally demonstrates a positive impact on students. For example, while immersed in a different culture, American students typically report higher levels of change in their attitudes toward the host country, the United States, and in their perceptions of themselves and their lives (Carlson, Burn, Useem, & Yachimowicz, 1990). Additionally, studying abroad increases American students’ foreign language skills, allows students to grow interpersonally, and gives students an opportunity to be more independent and develop more tolerant views (Limburg-Weber, 2000). Juhasz and Walker (1988) found that students who studied abroad reported lower self-esteem and self-efficacy scores than students who did not study abroad, but argued that this was indeed a positive outcome. They posited that these lower scores indicated that study abroad students were more mature and that they viewed themselves more objectively.

Gallant (2002) interviewed study abroad students and wrote a book to guide future study abroad students. According to Gallant (2002), the study abroad experience was difficult for students to explain, “for many students, the experience is so positive in so many ways that they can’t even begin to put it into words” (p. 2). Students were, however, quite able to give practical advice for those studying abroad, ranging from budgeting resources to dealing with being an American in a foreign country. Armstrong (1984) also stated that upon their return, study abroad students had difficulty singling out a positive experience. Instead, there were themes of positive outcomes, including “1) change in self-perception, 2) change in perceptions of others, 3) opportunities to gain language fluency, 4) opportunity to experience living abroad (Armstrong, 1984, p. 3).

Few negative experiences are reported in study abroad research. Wilkinson (2000) argued that when studies are not statistically significant, researchers tend

to blame the measures used rather than consider the experience. Based on her case study, contrasts were found between study abroad students’ expectations and their actual experiences. Those contrasts were cross-cultural misunderstandings, less than optimal host family situations, and unimpressive linguistic progress (Wilkinson, 2000).

Study abroad instructors have also made curricular suggestions based on their teaching experiences abroad. For example, Talburt and Stewart (1999) found weekly papers describing students’ cultural observations could be used in class discussions to help students’ process and reflect on their experiences while studying abroad. Early in their study abroad experience, students were confused by daily interaction and the course helped “make sense of their experiences” (Talburt & Stewart, 1999, p. 167). However, when trying to make sense of another culture, American students tended to use the United States as their lens for reflection.

Kauffmann, Martin, and Weaver (1992) stated that research conducted on the study abroad experience has been inconclusive because of research methodologies. They contend that study abroad researchers miss important data by not interviewing students about their experiences. Based on an analysis of 41 study abroad research articles, students reported less personal growth and development when taking quantitative measures than with qualitative measures (Kauffmann et al., 1992). Therefore, personal one-on-one interviews may provide a deeper understanding of the study abroad experience. Katula and Threnhauser (1999) ask, “how does the student reflect upon the experience?” (p. 247). Reflection is an important component in the study abroad experience. It makes sense that reflection may be an important component of studying abroad because it is a unique experiential learning situation.

Experiential Learning

Experiential learning attempts to provide concrete examples and experiences outside of the classroom. Study abroad can be considered a form of experiential learning. Experiential learning has been defined as immersing students in a learning experience and reflecting about those experiences “to develop new skills, new attitudes, or new ways of thinking” (Lewis & Williams, 1994, p. 5). Katula and Threnhauser (1999) state that we have an unquestioned assumption that studying abroad is an inherently enriching experience. However, they question how students perceive the study abroad as an experiential learning experience.

Bardhan (2003) posits that public relations students needed more of an international perspective in their undergraduate curriculum. When students were asked what influenced their decisions to participate in extra-curricular activities outside of the classroom, life experiences dominated. However, a majority of the students reported growing up in homogeneous communities and tended to have an ethnocentric perception of America. In addition, Bardhan (2003) found students wanted to participate in experiential learning in the form of studying abroad and exchange programs. In other words, by studying abroad, students would gain the experiential education they desire.

Because students are immersed in another culture 24 hours a day, experiential learning can take place not only in the classroom abroad, but also in everyday interactions. Hopkins (1999) argues that students not only learn about another culture, but also about themselves. "When students go abroad, they inevitably find themselves looking inward as well as outward, reconciling their views of themselves and their cultural assumptions with the new cultural context" (Hopkins, 1999, ¶ 4). Hopkins (1999) also states that study abroad students are the best source for explaining the value of studying abroad as experiential learning. Berge (1999) contends that education is more inquiry-based than in the past. As a result, students are becoming more self-directed, taking responsibility for their own learning.

This literature review demonstrates that the aboard experience may be an exceptional, eye opening, experiential learning opportunity for students. While scholarship demonstrates the benefits of studying abroad, too little is known about the lived-experience. In order to enhance the pedagogical decisions of study abroad instructors, the following question guides our research project:

RQ1: How do students describe the experiential learning that occurs in a study abroad experience?

Methods

This research was designed to produce an ethnographic account of students' experiences while studying abroad. As such, the goal was to provide a voice for students' unique experiences of the learning that takes place both in the classroom and by living in a foreign environment. The researchers' engaged in data collection procedures designed to empower research participants. The diary:diary-interview placed participants in the role of co-inquirers and recapitulated the basic structure of most ethnography (Zimmerman and Wieder, 1977). The focus group interview provided an opportunity for participants to present their experiences and expand their ideas by building off of the descriptions of other participants (Herdon, 1993). These data collection procedures decreased researcher bias and provided the participants maximum opportunities to engage as co-inquirers as they determined the content of the interview based on the experiences they wrote about their diaries.

Participants

In order to be considered a participant in this study, one needed to provide data while immersed in a study abroad experience. Therefore, the researchers employed a convenience sampling of university students engaged in the same study abroad program. Seventeen females (age 20-26) participated in this study. All of the participants were part of a four-week study abroad program in Ireland that was sanctioned and facilitated by a mid-sized midwestern university. All seventeen participants completed the requirements for participation (maintaining a diary and participated in individual diary-based interviews). Six of the participants were involved in a focus group interview six months after returning from their study abroad.

Data Collection

The data for this study were collected in three separate, but interrelated phases. The first phase involved study abroad participants providing "in the moment" descriptions their experiences. Participants were given a diary and asked to reflect on their experiences as university students studying abroad. Additionally, Participants were asked to offer several examples of experiences that applied to the content of their reflections. On four occasions participants were given class time to write responses to direct questions from the researchers.

The second part of data collection was the diary interview. The researchers read each participant's journal entries in order to determine questions that would be asked of that particular individual during her interview. The researchers' questions were based on pertinent, unexpected, or vehement diary entries that appeared to demonstrate the depth and breadth of the lived experience of studying abroad. The interview questions were designed to encourage participants to describe their experiences in honest and illuminating ways that provided deep and rich descriptions. Since each interview was based on the diary of the individual being interviewed, the questions were different for each interviewee. The individual interviews were audio taped, the responses were transcribed, and the data analyzed.

The third phase of data collection was a focus group interview with six participants and was conducted six months after the participants completed their study abroad experience. The purpose of the focus group interview was three-fold. First, the researchers felt that it was important to provide participants an opportunity to act as a "check" on their analysis of the study abroad experience. This "check" was important as it insured that this reported results accurately represented of the participants' experiences. Second, while "in the moment" descriptions were accurate representations of individual's immediate responses to experiences, they may not have been accurate representations of the impact of specific instances to the whole of a lived-experience. Therefore, the focus group interview provided participants an opportunity to reflect on the whole study abroad experience, discuss it, add to or contradict the responses of others, and clarify what they had described in their journal entries and interview responses. Finally, the focus group interview provided participants an opportunity to provide deeper and richer descriptions of their study abroad experiences. The focus group interview was audio taped, the responses were transcribed, and the data analyzed. Table 1 provides a graphic representation summarizing the data collection procedures.

Table 1: Summary of Data Collection Procedures*Journal Entries (231 pages)*

Students were asked to make journal entries each week in Ireland.

Interviews (17 subjects)

The diary: diary-interview process was used.

Journal entries were used to create interview questions.

Each interview was 20-30 minutes in length.

Post Ireland Focus Group (6 subjects)

Focus group data were transcribed.

Data Analysis

The researchers employed Straus and Corbin's (1990) constant comparative analysis, this method allowed results to surface through three stages. The constant comparative method engaged the researcher in a continuous back and forth process considering individual pieces of data and the whole text of collected data. Kvale (1996) compared the constant comparative process to a spiral, with a continuously deepening understanding of meaning. The constant comparative method of analysis involved three levels of coding: open, axial, and selective. In open coding phenomena were labeled, categories discovered, developed, and named according to their properties and dimensions. Axial coding involved a set of procedures whereby data were put back together in new ways after open coding, making connections between categories. Axial coding insured that the researchers engaged in comparing interpretations of single statements and the global meaning of the study (Kvale, 1996). Selective coding involved a process of choosing the core category—the central phenomenon around which all the other categories were integrated (Strauss & Corbin, 1990).

The data analysis for this study followed three specific steps. First, at the completion of the individual diary-based interviews, the researchers read all the diary entries and the interview transcripts as a single whole text. This reading of the data as a single text allowed the researchers to gain a global understanding of the participants study abroad experience. The second step involved each researcher returning to the journal entries and interview responses and identifying instances that demonstrated participant's claims of learning experiences while studying abroad. Each learning message was given a label. Repetitious messages and those containing similar meaning were collapsed together under a single label, clarifying the central meanings of the learning messages. The third step involved examining labeled messages, identifying conceptual relationships between them, and through a comparison/contrast analysis, creating mutually exclusive categories. These categories were then compared to the whole text of journal entries and interview responses to insure the categories accurately represented the lived experiences reported in participants' journal entries. The mutually exclusive categories were the basis for questions used during the focus group interview creating a check on the researchers' analysis, insuring an accurate representation of the study abroad students experiences. As a result of the focus group interview, one of the categories (the importance of building rela-

tionships with travel companions) was eliminated from the results. Participants claimed that they wrote about that issue in the here-and-now experience of studying abroad, but after reflecting on their experiences as a whole, it was not representative. The remaining five categories comprise the results of this study.

Results

The results presented here emerged as categories during the open and axial coding phases of the constant comparative analysis. These categories worded as declarative statements about the study abroad experience, represent how participants experienced learning while studying abroad and answer the research question that grounds this project. Table two identifies the categories that emerged in this study.

Table Two: Emergent Categories of Study Abroad Experiences

1. My eyes were opened in so many ways!
2. This is exactly what I expected only very different than anything I ever expected
3. At times I felt out of control
4. You just can't learn this kind of stuff in a classroom!
5. I learned so much about myself

The emergent categories, described individually, were mutually exclusive and significant in that they provided the greatest insight into the experiences of the study abroad students. In order to demonstrate the personal flavor of participants' experiences, yet maintain confidentiality, every account has been provided a fictional name. The phrase used most often to describe the myriad of situations that constituted "learning" during the study abroad experience was "my eyes were opened." Therefore, the first category described in these results was phrased to demonstrate participants' words.

My eyes were opened in so many ways!

Examples of culture shock were plentiful in the early journal entries of participants. The most prominent examples of culture shock in both the diary entries and focus group responses had to do with the basic human needs. Participants were shocked by the differences they experienced in types of food, service in restaurants, and having to pay for using restrooms (which were not plentiful). More dramatic and impacting differences experienced by the study abroad group were anti-American sentiments and the laidback attitude of the Irish. Wanda's diary entry describes the experiences of several participants: "The anti-American sentiment doesn't make me feel good. I don't want to stand out anymore. I'm ready to go home. I miss my family, Diet Dr. Pepper, my cell phone, ranch dressing and condiments you don't have to pay for." Condiments were a popular topic in the focus group interview. Several participants' claimed that in order to adjust to the food, they turned to condiments and found a new problem, "you have to pay for it!"(Jill). To counteract what Wanda called the "condiment conspiracy," participants devised strategies in order to keep for paying for

Speaker and Gavel, Vol 43 (2006)

www.dsr-tka.org/

ketchup. Since Monica carried a backpack wherever she went, Jill convinced her to keep a bottle of American ketchup in it for “restaurant emergencies.” While study abroad participants were able to plan and strategize ways to decrease the inconvenience of a lack of public facilities or having to pay for products that make ones’ food taste better, they found it more difficult to interact with people who were more laidback and those who expressed anti-American attitudes. Every participant in the study identified having their eyes opened by observing differences in the lifestyle and attitudes of the Irish and Europeans.

An early experience of culture shock occurred as participants began to recognize the differences in American and Irish perspectives on time. As Sally put it:

Compared to the States, people weren’t in a rush here. Time wasn’t as important, not needing to be on time. You felt relaxed being in this culture. They say we don’t have the time and we work more. They’re more late, which isn’t always a good thing.

While it was frustrating to wait for service, participants were much more adamant about their experiences with people being rude and having anti-American attitudes. Jennifer wrote in her diary about becoming intimately aware of the fact that there are people in this world who do not see America or Americans in a positive light, “It makes me feel not good about myself and my country. The lighter in my face was scary—didn’t like that. We are generalized. The world isn’t happy with the war and people think we are for it.” Pam described becoming aware of the assumptions made about Americans:

It makes me feel sad and embarrassed. Even though I don’t like George Bush, I still love being American. It is the loud Americans they remember. The comments about Bush don’t bother me, but I didn’t like that we didn’t vote him in and it isn’t really a democracy. The “fat Americans” comment, I felt bad because of being with large people who might think they are fat.

The study abroad participants eyes were opened in many ways. For several of the students the Ireland experience was an opportunity to encounter a culture that was drastically different than the one they grew up in. While many had traveled extensively within the United States, their travel was to generally “touristy” locales where they were not really exposed to the day-to-day differences in life styles, approaches to communication and attitudes.

This is exactly what I expected only very different than anything I ever expected

One of the dichotomies that emerged from participants’ diary entries and responses during the focus group interview concerned what participants expected to experience and their actual experiences. Several participants wrote about how much they enjoyed seeing the Ireland that they expected to see.

The experiences that matched expectations were generally seen as positive and affirming. For example, Donna claimed, “Today we went to Clifden and it was beautiful. It was what I had pictured Ireland to be like. Today, I saw what I really wanted to see.” Participants also claimed that experiencing “traditional” Irish activities and food was comforting. Denise describes a rewarding outing in which participants experienced several of the Irish traditions:

Last night was the first time I had a blast in Galway. All of us went out for fish and chips and then to Monroe’s bar. There was Irish dancing with traditional Irish music, which I thought was pretty entertaining.

While participants described a comfort when their experiences matched their expectations several claimed that they felt that such experiences lacked the depth of those that were unexpected and made them feel uncomfortable.

As previously described, one of the unexpected experiences was meeting with anti-American attitudes in Ireland and found in travels to other European countries. The participants were occasionally threatened, called warmongers, and told that Americans were all spoiled brats who got everything they wanted. While these bold anti-American encounters were not the norm, participants quickly learned that attitudes were different in Ireland than in the Midwestern American communities where these students were raised. Several participants expected the Irish to be friendly and accommodating, yet found that this attitude was not always present. Emily wrote about being surprised by the “real” Irish attitude:

Before I left, everyone kept telling me, you’re going to love it over there, the Irish are very friendly, very nice. When I got over there, no one stood out as being overly nice. The wait staff in restaurants ignored you, shopkeepers were not friendly unless you were buying something, and there was the whole Irish lie thing.

While participants noticed the differences in attitude, service, and helping tourists, they usually finished their journal entries or interview answers with a statement about how they had come to see the Irish as friendly, but in a different way than the Midwestern, America standards they knew. One of the interesting subjects that kept coming up in journal entries was “the Irish lie.” The “lie” was mentioned often, but never elaborated on in journal accounts. While the “lie” was always written about as a negative, it was described in the post-Ireland focus group interview as a highlight of the study abroad experience—an opportunity to learn about another culture.

During the focus group interview, one participant even claimed that she knew that she understood the culture when she was capable of getting by with a lie told to a “master of the Irish lie.” Participants learned to cope with differences in the Irish culture by creating strategies and learning to interpret messages more carefully. They were proud of these coping mechanisms. According

to participants the most impacting learning though occurred when participants dealt with situations in which they felt “out of control.”

At times I felt out of control

The experiences involving feelings of being out of control comprise the most painful, but meaningful learning reported by study abroad participants. Diary entries, interview responses, and focus group interview discussions were most fervent when participants described experiences where they felt out of control. Some of these experiences were preventable, such as finding oneself out of money and not knowing where to find an ATM to get cash. However, experiences such as having their apartment broken into on two occasions were not in the participants’ control. The participants felt it was quite important to describe these experiences and what they learned from them. Participants generally described that they had learned a great deal about themselves by their ability to survive experiences.

The most dramatic example of participants feeling out of control was a break in that occurred in Corrib Village. Several diary entries described the break in, but Karin’s own story came out in the focus group interview,

I was in the shower and some dude crawled in my window and stole my purse. And it was especially bad because I just got back from a trip and all my stuff was in my purse, so my passport, credit cards all forms of ID and my money. I realized it was gone and I went outside and looked outside and looked all around and realized I hadn’t misplaced it and so I started freaking out. I was mad at myself that I must have put it somewhere or left it in the bus. And when I came back in I realized my window was completely open—all the way open. And I never would have climbed on my desk and opened it. That was my worst out of control story. I was worried about not having any money. I’m screwed, I have two weeks left in Ireland, I have no money, no ID, there is nothing I can do.

Perhaps the most interesting aspect to Karin’s story, during the focus group interview was the conversation that followed. One of the participants responded to her story by reminding her that even though she felt that she was “screwed, with two weeks to go,” she got through it. Karin responded that while she never wanted to have to go through that experience again, she learned that she could handle challenges greater than she had ever dreamed. Karin felt that her ability to overcome the challenges brought on by the theft made her more confident and capable.

If conditions were bad when they got to Corrib Village, it got worse when they returned from a short trip. Jennifer wrote in her diary,

Turns out some other crazies broke into our apartment and partied, then left. Not surprised! The fact that people just broke in and partied, then left was weird. Oh well, Corrib Village, to put it quire frankly, sucks. Service wise as well as safety wise. It really sucks. I felt insecure with the place we were

living, but didn’t think we needed to lock up items in the kitchen. Corrib Village doesn’t know how to run a business. They made it sound like we made things up. The TV missing was their biggest concern.

Jennifer’s entry provides an accurate representation of the participants’ experiences and their perceptions of Corrib Village. Several diary entries expressed frustration with the services provided in Corrib Village, including a lack of concern from the staff about the instances, such as Jennifer’s, where people had their apartment broken into.

The concern written about most in diary entries and described most often in the interviews was the issue of money. Participants were surprised by exchange rates, costs associated with food, travel, and housing. Jenny summed up the general consensus of participants when she wrote, “I’m going totally broke, no question about that. I’m getting killed in the money department.” The greatest surprise for participants was how the exchange rate impacted their purchasing power. In her interview Jamie described an instance when she was impacted by the exchange rate,

I just found it hard. When we went to London and I cashed traveler checks, I remember I cashed \$50 and it was almost cut in half. It was a reality check for me. I was like, where is the rest of my money? That hit me hard.

Although students felt out of control at times, they also reported positive experiences.

I learned so much about myself

Participants were emphatic in claiming that the study abroad experience provided impacting life lessons. However, they found it difficult to articulate what they actually “learned” about themselves through the study abroad experience. Generally, participants would choose to provide examples of succeeding in a situation where they felt out of control. Leah and Becky’s story is an excellent example of participants’ responses,

Leah: We were in Spain and at the airport. Here we are we’re an hour out of the city where we need to be in Barcelona. We don’t have any pounds, any euros, or American dollars. Of course, why would you have those (group laughter). We needed to get into the city by bus where our hostel was and they didn’t accept credit cards or anything. So we were out of control. We’re speaking a different language.

Rebecca: I felt even more out of control because I don’t speak Spanish and I was following her around.

Leah: So really, it was just me! So I was like, okay, what do I do? I don’t know how to get there. There were only two more buses and we could be stuck at the airport. We might become arrested—no money. Granted, I’m

Speaker and Gavel, Vol 43 (2006)

www.dsr-tka.org/

using my language skills, but when you become nervous, you forget. Like, I can't remember how to say "hola." Here I am, running around, because they say, go here they might exchange money here. I don't understand. And then suddenly we are told to get on the bus and we can make an exchange when we get to the city, or at least that's what we are thinking they are telling us (laughter). Well when we got to the hostel we were able to make an exchange and pay the bus driver. Thank God! (laughter) To sum it up, it was just crazy, insane and hectic. All in all, it ended up being okay. That was my most out of control, out of my element, situation I was in and it really taught me a lot about myself!

When pressed to explain how her study abroad experiences taught her a great deal about herself, Leah claimed, "It's hard to say. I guess I learned that I can do things out of my box. I mean just coming here was a huge challenge! I had to adapt to different personalities, had to get along with everybody." For the most part, learning about oneself was positive and recognized through successfully completing a stressful situation. However, there were a few "learning" experiences that exposed participants to their weaknesses or habits they did not recognize about themselves. Erica's needing to lean on her father for money made her recognize that she was not as effective at managing her finances as she previously thought. A lesson in how people are influenced by their own culture was learned when participants recognized that they interacted differently when they drank in the pubs of Ireland. Wendy described the moment she recognized that the participants were indeed "loud Americans,"

Last night at the bar I could totally see where the "loud Americans" idea comes from. Our group of 15 or so was definitely very loud. We were all laughing and having a great time, but when I walked away, I noticed how much our loudness stood out.

In addition to learning so much about themselves, students also reported the positive impact of experiential learning.

You just can't learn this kind of stuff in a classroom!

The most passionate diary entries and interview descriptions came when participants addressed the importance of experiential learning as it pertained to the phenomenon of studying abroad. Jennifer wrote in her diary that, "I can't believe so many incredible experiences could happen to me in only 7 days. The best part of the time that's passed is that I feel comfortable here." Since most of the participants described a great deal of stress involved in the travel to Ireland, figuring out where to eat and go to the bathroom and feelings of being homesick, it was impacting when they reached a point of feeling comfortable. Participants became quite aware of their behaviors and began to write about times when they realized that they were having ethnocentric thoughts, were policing their behaviors in an attempt to fit in, and when they choose to act like an American knowing that it could bring on ridicule or ignite anti-American senti-

ments. Erin's diary entry is a good example of becoming aware of ethnocentric thoughts and consciously choosing to act like an American,

Last night was so much fun. We sang karaoke. The "proper," quite and boring Europeans just gazed at us—oops sorry—was that an ethnocentric thought there? I guess I just thought that since all they play here is American music, we're entitled to enjoy it, right? Oh well, we had a blast. Although we were the obnoxious "loud Americans," we called ourselves the "Canadian girls" and made a quick exit after our show.

Some of the journal entries posited that participants actually felt a "learning tension" as they had always thought of learning as a classroom activity, but now were immersed in experiential learning. Pam described the tension in her journal,

Learning over here has been very different. Not so much for the tests or assignments in class, but my learning has come mostly through talking with Irish people. These experiences have made me much more aware of my culture and have opened my mind up to a whole new way of seeing America. It's so interesting to me to just ask people what they think of Americans and why they feel that way. Just listening to them is very educational and entertaining to me. I think the main things students abroad should do is talk to the people as much as possible. I think I've learned more at the pubs/social scene than I have at class or from my book. These conversations are what I'll remember.

Victoria saw herself as having to fight to be motivated about the coursework that was assigned. She claimed,

One of the biggest challenges to studying abroad is that there is so much to see and so that the class's part of learning is hard to keep a focus on. I have so much to experience in such a different lifestyle and culture that it is hard to find time and motivation to study.

Participants in this study recognized a tension in the terms study and abroad. In the experiential learning environment of studying abroad participants felt it was difficult to determine when one is a student and when one is not. In the traditional American university experience, one sees learning as the act of attending class, listening to professors, studying, and being evaluated on papers, projects or exams. However, when studying abroad, participants felt that the more important learning occurred by interacting with locals and that the traditional pedagogy employed in the classroom and course assignments interfered with the experiential learning of studying abroad.

Discussion

The results of this study provide insights into the lived experience of studying abroad and the experiential learning participants identified as impacting. The purpose of this project is to add to the tradition of teachers who have offered suggestions on how to think about pedagogy while teaching abroad (Talbur & Stewart 1999; Wilkinson 2002). Therefore, this discussion will present the conclusions and recommendations together. Finally, the researchers will recognize the limitations of this study and offer suggestions for future research.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Four conclusions were identified from the results of this study. Each conclusion demonstrates a unique challenge that first time study abroad teachers are likely to face.

Conclusion one: The results of this study indicate a central concern for educators facilitating study abroad experiences; students have a difficult time with the interdependent terms *study* and *abroad*. In other words while American students have been socialized to think of academic coursework as “educational,” that very act creates a situation where they may not recognize the experiential learning that occurs on a daily basis in their everyday lives. However, when studying aboard the participants were quite aware that they were learning a great deal about the Irish culture, other cultures, differing worldviews, how Americans are perceived, etc. Additionally, participants were acutely aware of that they were learning about their own strengths, weakness, perceptual lenses, as well as their own ethnocentric thoughts and behaviors. With some “learning through immersion” going on, students found it difficult to put the time and energy into their academic work as they normally would. This led to frustrations as participants actually saw the expectations of the academic learning as interfering with the unique opportunity that was presented to them in the abroad experience. This conclusion demonstrates Katula and Threnhauser’s (1999) claim that student’s experiential learning in study abroad programs is important, but not well understood.

Recommendation one: Since studying abroad is an experiential learning occurrence it may call for a different type of pedagogy, especially for those teaching courses that they have taught in a traditional American classroom. In the case of this study, participants seemed to separate class content from their experiences outside the classroom. These students talked about how what they felt were the important “learning” they experienced could not be learned in a traditional American classroom. However, they failed to recognize that their learning was experiential. We recommend discussing experiential learning with students so they understand learning can and does occur outside the classroom, especially while studying abroad. Additionally, faculty should consider unique assignments that will provide students an opportunity to connect the experiential and classroom learning together. An example of an assignment that worked well was having students interview an Irish person to gain insight into their culture and its influence on their thoughts and behaviors. The advantage of this assignment was that it allowed students to use skills learned in the classroom (effective inter-

viewing techniques) to gain a more meaningful understanding of the Irish culture (their experiential learning).

Conclusion two: It is not surprising that the results of this study indicate that students will naturally have ethnocentric attitudes. This conclusion demonstrates Gallant’s (2002) contention that students learn a great deal about themselves, yet find it difficult to express what they learned. Additionally, participants’ diary entries and interview responses indicate that when students were exposed to their personal ethnocentric attitudes, impacting self-learning occurred as they engaged in reflection and critical thinking about their culture-induced attitudes and ultimately matured in their thoughts. This finding supports Juhasz and Walker’s (1988) belief that lower self-esteem and self-efficacy scores of study abroad students may be a positive demonstration of learning, reflection and maturity. Since participants indicated that they felt that the degree to which they learned about themselves was the most impacting aspect studying abroad, we feel that teachers should facilitate this learning.

Recommendation two: Teachers should use classroom interactions as opportunities to facilitate discussions about participants encountering cultural differences and how these experiences impact their learning about self and others. These discussions can become part of the classroom culture. Spending several minutes at the beginning of class talking about interactions in the host country can be a learning experience, even for students who were not involved in the exchange. In the study abroad experience described in this paper, as time progressed, students were able to recognize their ethnocentric views and understood that their view may not always be optimal. We recommend discussing ethnocentrism early in the study abroad experience so that students can reflect about their own values and beliefs early in their study abroad experience.

Conclusion three: By the very act of studying abroad, students and first time abroad facilitators are likely to experience anxieties as their basic physiological and safety needs are unfulfilled. Early entries described tensions related to physiological and safety needs which made it difficult for students to focus on either classroom or experiential learning. For example, participants needed some guidance in terms of food, restrooms, slang to avoid, and how to take safety precautions. Fortunately, participants moved through physiological and safety needs fairly quickly. In a traditional classroom, instructors typically do not concern themselves with the physiological or security needs of students. Perhaps study abroad facilitators need to find a way to address these needs.

Recommendation three: It is in the best interest of facilitators to reduce the uncertainty involved in studying abroad and specifically, providing participants the information necessary for satisfying their physiological and safety needs. Talbur and Stewart (1999) suggested that getting access to prior study abroad participants observations and experiences might help facilitators shape information provided to new participants and may be using in creating course content. We also recommend discussing students’ needs and strategies that may help them adapt to the culture in which they will be living.

Conclusion four: Learning does not stop when students reenter their host country. While not directly represented in the results of this study, participants

in the focus group appreciated the opportunity to talk about the abroad experience. In fact, several claimed that they understood their experiences much better after returning as they had time to reflect. Participants claimed that they wished there were structured opportunities to share their perceptions of learning after they had time to reflect.

Recommendation four: Reentry courses are another attempt at allowing students to process their study abroad experience. Because the students in this case study had very different entries while abroad as compared to their responses in the focus group six months after the experience, we also recommend a reentry element upon returning from studying abroad. We feel that an effective way to give this course credence for the students would be to have academic credit attached to it. The credit could be part of the existing credit offered for the abroad experience. For example, a six credit abroad course could have one or two of the credits held for the re-entry course.

Limitations and Future Research

The results, conclusions, and recommendations of this study are intended to provide future study abroad facilitators with necessary information and potential strategies for providing students with an exceptional learning experience. Yet it is also important to point out that this study represents the experiences of a distinct group of people, studying in a particular culture at a unique time in history. We do not assume that our results are indicative of all students who study abroad and do not intend for our results to be generalized to other populations. It is quite possible that participants who study abroad in different locales and at times when America is not involved in a disputed military engagement would not experience anti-American attitudes or unsanitary/unsafe living conditions. Therefore, it is important to acknowledge these limitations.

The results of this study raise several questions, laying the foundation for future research. Therefore, we provide the following two recommendations for future research. First, the purpose of studying abroad is to accomplish the dual purpose of study and travels to a different culture. Several participants in this study acknowledged that they felt they learned more through their travel and experiences than they did in the classroom. A study that focused on the question of what constitutes "learning" when studying abroad may provide unique insights into participants' perceptions of the abroad education. Such a study could lead to creative pedagogy that would effectively incorporate the terms study and abroad.

Second, participants' journals and interview accounts indicated a variety of tensions that were experienced while studying abroad. A strong body of research in communication studies focuses on dialectical tensions and how they impact intrapersonal and interpersonal relationships. A study that focuses on the dialectical tensions experienced while studying abroad may provide insight that would help prepare facilitators to help students work through these tensions.

Conclusion

This research study provided empirical data to demonstrate the unique learning involved in studying abroad. The results indicate that students consider studying abroad an exceptional educational experience. The results also indicate that students find their abroad education to be deeply personal and impacting. As such, instructional communication scholars should engage in more research to understand the unique pedagogical act of studying abroad. Such inquiry may provide insights that allow educators to replicate the impacting educational experiences achieved abroad in courses in which students stay put. Ultimately, this research posits that creative pedagogy may make the study abroad experience even more educational and impacting.

References

- Armstrong, G. K. (1984). Life after study abroad: A survey of undergraduate academic and career choices. *The Modern Language Journal*, 68 (1), 1-6.
- Bardhan, N. (2003). Creating spaces for international and multi(inter)cultural perspectives in undergraduate public relations education. *Communication Education*, 52 (2), 164-172.
- Berge, Z. (1999). Online teaching: Purposes and methods. *The Electronic Journal of Communication*, 9 (1).
- Carlson, J. S., Burn, B. B., Useem, J., & Yachimowicz, D. (1990). *Study abroad: The experience of American undergraduates*. New York: Greenwood Press.
- Chesebro, J. L., & McCroskey, J. C. (2001). The relationship of teacher clarity and immediacy with student state receiver apprehension, affect, and cognitive learning. *Communication Education*, 50, (1), 59-68.
- Chesebro, J. L., & McCroskey, J. C. (1998). The relationship between teacher clarity and immediacy and students' experiences of state receiver apprehension when listening to teachers. *Communication Quarterly*, 46, 446-456.
- Christensen, L. J., & Menzel, K. E. (1998). The linear relationship between student reports of teacher immediacy behaviors and perceptions of state motivation, and of cognitive, affective, and behavioral learning. *Communication Education*, 47, (1), 82-90.
- Christophel, D. M. (1990). The relationships among teacher immediacy behaviors, student motivation, and learning. *Communication Education*, 39 (4), 323-340.
- Dobos, J. A. (1996). Collaborative learning: Effects of student expectations and communication apprehension on student motivation. *Communication Education*, 45 (2), 118-134.
- Dixon-Shaver, L., & Shaver, P. M. (1995, April). *Implementing experiential learning in the higher education intercultural communication class*. Presented at the annual meeting of the Southern States Communication Convention, New Orleans, LA.
- Frymier, A. B. (1994). The use of affinity-seeking in producing liking and learning in the classroom. *Journal of Applied Communication*, 22 (2), 87-105.

- Frymier, A. B., & Thompson, C. A. (1992). Perceived teacher affinity-seeking in relation to perceived teacher credibility. *Communication Education, 41*, 388-399.
- Gallant, M. (2002). *Getting the most from study abroad*. New York: Natavi Guides.
- Gorham, J. (1988). The relationship between verbal teacher immediacy behaviors and student learning. *Communication Education, 37* (1), 40-53.
- Gorham, J., Cohen, S. H., & Morris, T. L. (1999). Fashion in the classroom III: Effects of instructor attire and immediacy in natural classroom interactions. *Communication Quarterly, 47* (3), 281-299.
- Gorham, J., Kelley, D. H., & McCroskey, J. C. (1989). The affinity-seeking of classroom teachers: A second perspective. *Communication Quarterly, 37* (1), 16-26.
- Herndon, S. L. (1993). Using focus group interviews for preliminary investigation. In S. L. Herndon and G. L. Kreps (Eds.), *Qualitative research: Applications in organizational communication*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press, Inc.
- Hopkins, J. R. (1999). Studying abroad as a form of experiential education [Electronic version]. *Liberal Education, 85* (3), 36-41.
- Juhasz, A. M., & Walker, A. M. (1988). The impact of study abroad on university students' self-esteem and self-efficacy. *College Student Journal, 22* (4), 329-341.
- Katula, R. A., & Threnhauser, E. (1999). Experiential education in the undergraduate curriculum. *Communication Education, 48* (3), 238-255.
- Kauffmann, N. L., Martin, J. N., & Weaver, H. D. (1992). *Students abroad, strangers at home: Education for a global society*. Yarmouth, MA: Intercultural Press.
- Kerssen-Griep, J. (2001). Teacher communication activities relevant to student motivation: Classroom facework and instructional communication competence. *Communication Education, 50* (3), 256-273.
- Koester, J. (1984). Communication and the intercultural reentry: A course proposal. *Communication Education, 33*, (3), 251-256.
- Kvale, S. (1996). *Interviews: An introduction to qualitative research interviewing*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Lane, D. R., & Shelton, M. W. (2001). The centrality of communication education in classroom computer-mediated-communication: Toward a practical and evaluative pedagogy. *Communication Education, 50* (3), 241-255.
- LaRose, R., & Whitten, P. (2000). Re-thinking instructional immediacy for Web courses: A social cognitive exploration. *Communication Education, 49*, (4), 320-338.
- Lewis, L., & Williams, C. (1994). Experiential learning: Past and present. In L. Jackson & R. Caffarella (Eds.), *Experiential learning: A new approach* (pp. 5-16). *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education, no. 62*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Limburg-Weber, L. (2000). Send them packing: Study abroad as an option for gifted students. [Electronic version]. *Journal of Secondary Gifted Education, 11* (2), 43- 51.
- Marcum, J., & Roochnick, D. (2001). What direction for studying abroad? *Chronicle of Higher Education, 47*, B7-B11.
- Marklein, M (2003). Students' interest in overseas study still raising. *USA Today, 7D*.
- Martin, J. N. (1989). Predeparture orientation: Preparing college sojourners for intercultural interaction. *Communication Education, 38*, 249-258.
- Martin, J. N. (1986). Communication in the intercultural reentry: Student sojourners' perceptions of change in reentry relationships. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 10*, 1-22.
- McCroskey, L. L., Richmond, V. P., and McCroskey, J. C. (2002). The scholarship of teaching and learning: Contributions from the discipline of Communication. *Communication Education, 51* (4), 383-391.
- Myers, S. A. (2002). Perceived aggressive instructor communication and student state motivation, learning, and satisfaction. *Communication Reports, 15* (2), 113-121.
- Myers, S. A., & Knox, R. L. (2000). Perceived instructor argumentativeness and verbal aggressiveness and student outcomes. *Communication Research Reports, 17*, (3), 299-309.
- Myers, S. A., & Knox, R. L. (1999). Verbal aggression in the college classroom: Perceived instructor use and student affective learning. *Communication Quarterly, 47* (1), 33-45.
- Richmond, V. P. (1990). Communication in the classroom: Power and motivation. *Communication Education, 39* (3), 181-195.
- Schrodt, P., Wheelless, L. R., & Ptacek, K. M. (2000). Informational reception apprehension, educational motivation, and achievement. *Communication Quarterly, 48* (1), 60-73.
- Straus, A. & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Talbur, S., & Stewart, M. (1999). What's the subject of study abroad?: Race, Gender and "living culture." *The Modern Language Journal, 83* (2), 163-175.
- Teven, J. J., & McCroskey, J. C. (1997). The relationship of perceived teacher caring with student learning and teacher evaluation. *Communication Education, 46*, (1), 1-9.
- Wanzer, M. B., & Frymier, A. B. (1999). The relationship between student perceptions of instructor humor and students' reports of learning. *Communication Education, 48*, (1), 48-62.
- Wilkinson, S. (2000). Emerging questions about study abroad. *ADFL Bulletin, 32* (1), 36- 41.
- Witherell, S. (2002, November). *Open doors 2002: Americans studying abroad*. Retrieved September 24, 2003, from <http://opendoors.iienetwrok.org/?p=25084>

Scott Dickmeyer is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Communication Studies, University of Wisconsin—La Crosse, 54601.

Ronda Knox is a Professor in the Department of Communication Studies, University of Wisconsin—La Crosse, 54601

A Functional Analysis of Non-Presidential Primary Debates

William L. Benoit
Jayne Henson

Abstract

Despite the fact that political debates are increasingly common at all levels of government, relatively little work investigates the content of non-presidential debates (and work on primary debates is even less common). This study breaks new ground by analyzing four non-presidential primary debates. Two Democratic gubernatorial debates, one Republican U.S. Senate debate, and one Republican U.S. House debate were content analyzed using the framework of the functional theory of political campaign discourse. Overall, these debates were mainly positive, with 71% acclaims, 22% attacks, and 7% defenses. The Democratic (and gubernatorial) debates had more attacks and defenses and fewer defenses than the Republican (congressional) debates. Overall, these campaign messages focused more on policy (60%) than character (40%). The Democratic (gubernatorial) debates emphasized policy even more (65% to 55%), and character less (35% to 45%), than the Republican (congressional) debates.

Key Terms: non-presidential primary debates, gubernatorial, U.S. Senate, U.S. House, functional theory

Introduction

Political debates have been proliferating in recent years. The first presidential debate, between Republican contenders Thomas Dewey and Harold Stassen in 1948, was broadcast on radio during the Oregon primary campaign (Benoit et al., 2002). However, in the past several election cycles the number of presidential primary debates has increased sharply, with 18 debates occurring in the 2004 Democratic primary campaign alone. The first general presidential debate was held in 1960 between Richard Nixon and John Kennedy (Benoit & Harthcock, 1999). After a hiatus, general debates resumed in 1976 when President Gerald Ford confronted Governor Jimmy Carter and debates have been a fixture of the general campaign ever since. Vice presidential debates were held in 1976 and from 1984-2004 (Benoit & Airne, 2005). Other countries have also seen presidential debates in recent years (see, e.g., Coleman, 2000). Debates are also being held for candidates running for other elective offices in the United States, such as senator and governor.

Considerable research has investigated presidential debates (books on this topic include Benoit & Wells, 1996; Bishop, Meadow, & Jackson-Beeck, 1978; Bitzer & Rueter, 1980; Carlin & McKinney, 1994; Friedenber, 1994, 1997; Hellweg, Pfau, & Brydon, 1992; Hinck, 1993; Jamieson & Birdsell, 1988; Speaker and Gavel, Vol 43 (2006)

www.dsr-tka.org/

Kraus, 1962, 1979, 2000; Lanoue & Schrott, 1991; Martel, 1983; and Schroeder, 2000). Although there are many useful ways to study debates, one approach is to employ content analysis to understand the nature of these important campaign messages. Some research has also focused on presidential primary debates. Benoit et al. (2002) reported that presidential debates from the primary phase of the campaign employed more acclaims (63% to 55%), fewer attacks (32% to 35%), and fewer defenses (4% to 10%) than general debates. They also reported that primary debates stressed character more (37% to 25%) and policy less (63% to 75%) than general debates. Research (Benoit, Brazeal, & Airne, 2006) has begun to examine non-presidential debates from the general phase of the campaign; as yet we have no data on non-presidential primary debates.

We have studied primary and general presidential debates. Research has found that presidential primary debates have more acclaims and defenses, and fewer attacks, than general debates: Primary debates have 63% acclaims, 32% attacks, and 4% defenses; general debates have 55% acclaims, 35% attacks, and 10% defenses (Benoit, in press). The topic emphases of these debates also differs. Presidential primary debates stress character more (37% to 25%) and policy less (63% to 75%) than general debates (Benoit, in press)

Few studies have investigated non-presidential debates. Pfau (1983) was concerned with debate format, Bystrom et al. (1991) and Lichtenstein (1983) looked at the effects of non-presidential debates, and Edelsky and Adams (1990) studied gender differences. Two recent studies have investigated the content of non-presidential debates. Banwart and McKinney (2005) content analyzed two U.S. senate and 2 gubernatorial debates from 2000 and 2002. They reported that these debates included more positive (79%) than negative (21%) comments and emphasized policy (82%) over character (18%). Airne and Benoit (2005) content analyzed the 2004 Senate debates between Obama and Keyes: 59% of the statements were acclaims, 37% were attacks, and 4% were defenses. They found policy was discussed more often than character (65% to 35%). So, what research is available has found them to be mostly positive and about policy, but it has not examined non-presidential primary debates.

Debates are political campaign message forms that are clearly worth studying. As noted earlier, they are increasingly common in political campaigns at different levels of government. They have several advantages over other message forms. Debates feature the leading candidates, side-by-side, addressing the same issues. This format helps voters make a choice between those contenders. Debates are more extended message forms than other media such as television spots. Furthermore, debates have been shown to have significant effects on viewers. Meta-analysis demonstrates that presidential debates have several effects on viewers: increasing issue knowledge, affecting agenda-setting, altering character perceptions, and vote preference. Furthermore, the effects are larger with presidential primary debates than general election debates (Benoit, Hansen, & Verser, 2003), presumably because voters have less knowledge of the candidates during the primary. Although none of this research on debate effects has investigated non-presidential primary debates, it seems plausible that they could influence viewers as well.

One legitimate approach to studying political debates is to systematically analyze their content. Accordingly, this study will employ content analysis to investigate three non-presidential primary debates; these findings will be contrasted with the results of prior research on non-presidential general campaign debates. First, we will describe the theory which informed the study. Then we will report the method employed to analyze the debates. This will be followed by presentation of results and discussion of implications.

Functional Theory of Political Campaign Discourse

Functional Theory provided the underpinning for this study. This approach to political campaign communication begins with several assumptions about this kind of discourse (1999, in press; Benoit, Blaney, & Pier, 1998; Benoit et al. 2003). First, people cast their votes for the candidate who seems *preferable* based on what is most important to each voter. Their opinions about which candidate is better are perceptions developed from messages they receive from the candidates, from the news, and from other sources including political discussion with friends and family. Candidates can attempt to influence these perceptions by enacting three functions in their messages. *Acclaims* (Benoit, 1997) are positive statements intended to make the candidate appear more desirable. *Attacks* are criticisms of an opponent, designed to make that candidate appear less desirable. Finally, *defenses* are refutations of or responses to attacks, meant to reduce the undesirable effects of an attack. Together, these three functions work like an informal form of cost-benefit analysis. Acclaims, if accepted by the audience, should increase that candidate's benefits (make the source of an acclaim appear more desirable). Attacks, when persuasive, should increase the costs of an opponent (making the opponent look less desirable). This should increase the attacking candidate's net favorability. Finally, when attacked, an effective defense should restore lost desirability by minimizing costs. Notice that Functional Theory does not assume that voters actively seek out information about the candidates or engage in mathematical calculations; the point is that acclaims have a tendency to increase the perceived desirability of a candidate, attacks are prone to reduce the apparent desirability of an opponent, and defenses can help restore lost desirability.

Functional Theory posits that these three functions can occur on two topics. *Policy* utterances concern governmental action and the consequences or outcomes of governmental action. *Character* remarks address the personality or leadership of the candidates. Each topic is further subdivided, policy into *past deeds*, *future plans*, and *general goals*; character is comprised of *personal qualities*, *leadership ability*, and *ideals*. The Appendix provides an example of an acclaim and an attack on each of these forms of policy and character.

Specifically, this study will test six hypotheses using data from these two primary debates based on the research on presidential campaign messages. Acclaims have no drawbacks, attacks may create some backlash from voters who dislike mudslinging, and defenses have three disadvantages (a response to an attack may take a candidate off-message, it may remind or inform voters of a candidate's alleged weakness, and it may create the impression that the candi-

date is reactive rather than proactive. Research on presidential primary debates found that acclaims are the most common function whereas defense is the least frequent function (Benoit, et al., 2002). Accordingly, we predict that:

H1. Acclaims will be more common than attacks, and defenses will be the least common function of non-presidential primary debates.

More voters say that the most important determinant of their vote for president is policy rather than character (Benoit, 2003); some evidence suggests that this preference may carry over to other political offices (Brazeal & Benoit, 2001). In fact, past studies of presidential primary debates reported that policy was discussed more often than character (Benoit et al., 2002). So, we predict:

H2. Policy themes will be more common than character themes in non-presidential primary debates.

It is easier to acclaim than attack on principles, values, and goals. Research has also established that candidates in presidential primary debates are more likely to acclaim than attack on both general goals and ideals (Benoit et al., 2002).

H3. General goals will be employed more to acclaim than attack in non-presidential primary debates.

H4. Ideals will be employed more to acclaim than attack in non-presidential primary debates.

Benoit (in press) found that in primary debates and primary direct mail brochures (albeit not in primary television spots) Democrats attacked more than Republicans. For this reason, we expect that:

H5. Democrats will attack more, and acclaim less, than Republicans in non-presidential primary debates.

Benoit (2004) reports that Democratic presidential candidates emphasize policy more than do Republicans. He explains that this may occur because Democrats have a proclivity to suggest governmental solutions to public problems. Republicans are more prone than Democrats to encourage private solutions to these problems. Therefore, we predict that:

H6. Democrats will discuss policy more, and character less, than Republicans in non-presidential primary debates.

Testing these hypotheses with non-presidential primary debates will extend our understanding of political campaign debates.

Sample and Method

This study investigated four non-presidential primary debates. In order to balance political party affiliation, four debates were analyzed for this study. Two Democratic gubernatorial primary debates from Missouri in 2004 (Bob Holden versus Claire McCaskill, July 19, 20), a Republican U.S. Senate primary debate from Iowa in 2002 (Greg Ganski versus Bill Salier, May 31), and a Republican U.S. Senate debate from Utah in 2004 (Tim Bridgewater versus John Swallow, June 10) comprised the sample.¹ We were unable to locate texts of any other gubernatorial or congressional primary debates. This sample is limited, but the fact that this is exploratory research justifies this inquiry.

The method employed to analyze the content of these non-presidential primary debates has four steps. First, the candidates' utterances were unitized into themes (remarks by the moderator and questions were not analyzed, although they were part of the context unit employed to interpret the candidates' remarks). Berelson (1952) defined a theme as "an assertion about a subject" (p. 138; see also Holsti, 1969). Thus, a theme is essentially an argument about one of the candidates (an argument_i in O'Keefe's terms; 1977). Because discourse is enthymematic, themes vary in length from a phrase to several sentences. Second, each theme was categorized by function, according to these definitions:

Acclaims "portray the candidate in a favorable light"

Attacks "portray the [opposing] candidate in an unfavorable light"

Defenses "attempt to repair the candidate's reputation (from attacks by the opposition)." (Benoit & Harthcock, 1999, p. 346)

Third, the topic of each theme was categorized, using these definitions.

Policy utterances "concern governmental action (past, current, or future) and problems amenable to governmental action"

Character utterances "address characteristics, traits, abilities, or attributes of the candidates" (Benoit & Harthcock, 1999, p. 346)

Finally, the form of policy or character in each theme was identified.

Coders were trained with a codebook. This document defines the coding unit (the theme) and the context unit (questions and remarks by the candidate or opponent which help interpret a theme). It describes the steps involved in the method outlined above and provides definitions and textual examples of each category. Inter-coder reliability was calculated using Cohen's (1960) κ , which corrects for agreement by chance. κ for classifying themes for function was .89. κ for identifying the topic of an utterance was .91. κ for categorizing themes into the forms of policy was .86 and κ for forms of character was .94. Landis and Koch (1977) explained that κ s between .81-1.0 represent "almost perfect" inter-coder reliability (p. 165). Accordingly, these figures give confidence in the reliability of these data.

Results

Testing the hypotheses posed earlier will illustrate how content analysis can be used to study the nature of political debates. The first hypothesis predicted that acclaims would be more common than attacks and defenses would be the least common function. The first hypothesis was supported: Acclaims in these Speaker and Gavel, Vol 43 (2006)

primary debates constituted 71% of their utterances, attacks were 22% of their statements, and defenses comprised 7% of their remarks; this ordering of function occurred in each of the four debates. For example, Holden reported that “83,000 new jobs have been created in the state of Missouri,” which is clearly a desirable record (an *acclaim*). McCaskill provided an example of an *attack* when she charged that “You signed budget cuts for education.” Candidates in a Democratic primary would be expected to support funding for education. Holden *defended* against this accusation by shifting the blame: “If there is a problem about tuition, we ought to be talking about Republicans and how they cut funding for education.” A one-way χ^2 confirmed that this distribution was significantly different from chance ($\chi^2 [df = 2] = 671.53, p < .0001$; *chi-squares* calculated on each set of two functions were also significant). These data are reported in Table 1.

Table 1
Functions Non-Presidential Primary Debates

	Acclaims	Attacks	Defenses
Gubernatorial	343 (67%)	126 (25%)	46 (9%)
Senate	78 (50%)	59 (38%)	19 (12%)
House	249 (90%)	25 (9%)	3 (1%)
Total	699 (71%)	211 (22%)	68 (7%)

Hypothesis two predicted that policy comments would occur more frequently than character remarks. In fact, together these debates addressed policy in 60% of their themes and character in 40%; policy was more common than character in each individual debate. For example, Holden discussed *policy* when he argued that “I was one of the four governors in the entire country that actually was able to do something about outsourcing” of jobs. Clearly, employment is a policy topic. McCaskill provided an example of a *character* utterance when she questioned Holden’s leadership ability: The governor and the legislature “can’t come together even on the things they agree. That is why we need new leadership.” This utterance does not discuss any particular policy but instead concerns the governor’s ability to govern the state. A one-way χ^2 confirmed that these two topics occurred with different frequencies ($\chi^2 [df = 1] = 37.22, p < .0001$). These data are displayed in Table 2.

Table 2
Topics of Non-Presidential Primary Debates

	Policy	Character
Gubernatorial	303 (64%)	168 (36%)
Senate	81 (59%)	56 (41%)
House	147 (54%)	127 (46%)
Total	531 (60%)	349 (40%)

The next hypothesis predicted that general goals would be used more often to acclaim than attack. In these data, there were 208 acclaims and 13 attacks on general goals. A one-way *chi-square* confirms the obvious, that this is a significant difference ($\chi^2 [df = 1] = 170.3, p < .0001$). The third hypothesis was supported. See Table 3.

Table 3
Forms of Policy and Character in Non-Presidential Primary Debates

	Policy						Character					
	PD*		FP		GG		PQ		LA		ID	
Gubernatorial	128	61	21	3	89	1	32	40	27	22	45	0
	189 (62%)		24 (8%)		90 (30%)		72 (43%)		49 (30%)		45 (27%)	
Senate	14	23	5	0	30	9	7	18	9	3	13	6
	37 (46%)		5 (6%)		39 (48%)		25 (45%)		12 (21%)		19 (34%)	
House	7	9	39	0	89	3	41	8	26	5	47	0
	16 (11%)		39 (26%)		92 (63%)		49 (39%)		31 (24%)		47 (37%)	
Total	149	93	65	3	208	13	80	66	62	30	105	6
	242 (46%)		68 (13%)		221 (42%)		146 (42%)		92 (26%)		111 (32%)	

*acclaims/attacks

Hypothesis four expected that, like general goals, ideals would be used more often to acclaim than attack. The two candidates used ideals to acclaim in 105 themes and to attack 6 times. *Chi-square* confirms that these are signifi-

cantly different ($\chi^2 [df = 1] = 86.52, p < .0001$). The data are displayed in Table 3.

The sixth prediction expected that Democrats would attack more in primary debates than Republicans. This was confirmed as Democrats acclaimed less (66% to 76%), attacked more (25% to 19%), and defended more (9% to 5%) than Republicans. Statistical analysis revealed this to be significant ($\chi^2 [df = 2] = 10.62, p < .01, V = .11$; significant differences also occurred between acclaims and attacks). See Table 4 for these data.

Table 4
Political Party and Functions and Topics of Non-Presidential Primary Debates

	Functions		
	Acclaims	Attacks	Defenses
Democrats	342 (66%)	127 (25%)	46 (9%)
Republicans	327 (76%)	84 (19%)	22 (5%)
	Topics		
	Policy	Character	
Democrats	303 (65%)	166 (35%)	
Republicans	228 (55%)	183 (45%)	

The last hypothesis predicted Democrats would stress policy more, and character less, than Republicans in non-presidential primary debates. This prediction was also supported, as Democrats emphasized policy more (65% to 55%) and character less (35% to 45%) than Republican candidates. Statistical analysis reveals this to be significant ($\chi^2 [df = 1] = 7.63, p < .01, \phi = .09$). These data are displayed in Table 4.

Discussion

We now have learned something about political debates in a new context: non-presidential primary contests. Although the sample is limited, it includes gubernatorial, U.S. Senate, and U.S. House debates from the primary phase of the campaign. We now know something about non-presidential debates and factors that influence the content of these messages (e.g., campaign phase).

The analysis reported here indicate that these non-presidential primary campaign messages have certain features in common with presidential primary campaign messages. Acclaims were the most common function of these de-

bates, followed by attacks and then defenses. Acclaims have no drawbacks, so it makes sense that they would be the most common function. Voters consistently report that they do not like mudslinging (Merritt, 1975; Stewart, 1984), so there is a reason for attacks to occur less frequently than acclaims. Finally, defenses have three potential drawbacks. First, one must identify an attack to refute it. Doing so risks reminding or even informing the audience of a potential weakness. Second, attacks are most likely to occur in a candidate's areas of weakness. Defending against an attack would usually take a candidate off-message. Third, the act of responding to an attack may create the impression that the candidate is reactive rather than proactive. For these reasons it is reasonable to expect that defenses will be relatively uncommon.

Furthermore, these debates were more positive (more acclaims, fewer attacks) than either presidential primary debates or general presidential debates (Benoit, in press). Although we do not have data for US House or gubernatorial debates from the general campaign, a study of 15 US Senate general debates from 1998-2004 found that these general debates were not as positive as these primary debates: 61% acclaims, 29% attacks, and 10% defenses (Benoit, Brazeal, & Airne, 2006). Thus, these data indicate that, as in presidential debates, non-presidential primary debates are more positive than non-presidential general debates. Benoit et al. (2002) explain why primary debates are less negative than general debates at the presidential level:

First, candidates will want their opponents in the primary season—and perhaps even more important, their opponents' adherents—to support them in the general campaign. . . . Second, candidates from one party will recycle attacks made in the primary season against their fall opposition. . . . Thus, a second reason to moderate attacks in the primary is to avoid providing fodder for the other party's attacks in the general campaign. A third reason to expect somewhat fewer attacks in the primary than in the general campaign is that, presumably, there are more grounds for attack in the fall (more differences between parties than within a party). (pp. 121-122)

These factors should be at work in non-presidential races as well as in presidential contests. So, non-presidential primary debates use acclaims more than attacks, and attacks more than defenses—and they are less negative than general campaign debates.

The candidates in these non-presidential primary debates discussed policy more than character. Public opinion poll data reveals that more voters say that issues (policy) are a more important determinant for their vote for president (Benoit, 2003) and for congress (Brazeal & Benoit, 2001) than character. We were unable to locate similar public opinion poll data for the most determinant of gubernatorial votes, but it is plausible to speculate that more voters consider policy to be most important and that candidates respond to these voter preferences when they emphasize policy over character.

A greater emphasis on policy than character is consistent with past research on presidential debates from both phases of the campaign (Benoit, in press).

Speaker and Gavel, Vol 43 (2006)

www.dsr-tka.org/

Furthermore, general presidential debates emphasize policy even more than primary presidential debates (Benoit et al., 2002). Consistent with this finding, general debates from the U.S. Senate discussed policy even more (70% to 60%) than the non-presidential primary debates in this sample (Benoit, Brazeal, & Airne, 2006). Benoit et al. (2002) explain that candidates in the primary phase are generally less well-known than candidates in the general campaign, which is a reason to stress character more in the primary than the general election. Furthermore, candidates from the same political party (i.e., those competing in primary debates) should have fewer policy differences than candidates from opposing parties (i.e., those competing in general debates). This means that it is easier to distinguish two candidates on character, and more difficult to distinguish them on policy, in primary than general debates.

Certain forms of discourse lend themselves more readily to acclaims than attacks. In these debates, general goals were used more frequently as the basis for acclaims than for attacks. Similarly, ideals were used in many more acclaims than attacks. More jobs, more affordable college education, help for seniors' prescription drug costs are goals that are easy to support but difficult to attack. Similarly, such values as fairness and equality are easy to embrace in an acclaim but more difficult to attack. The same tendencies (990 acclaims and 144 attacks on general goals; 155 acclaims and 42 attacks on ideals) were found in presidential debates (Benoit, in press) and in U.S. Senate debates (Benoit, Brazeal, & Airne, 2006).

We found that Democrats attacked more, and acclaimed less, than Republicans in these non-presidential primary debates. The relationship between political party affiliation and function of campaign discourse is not entirely consistent. At the presidential level, Democrats are more negative than Republicans in primary and general debates, but not in primary TV spots or in Acceptance Addresses. General U.S. Senate debates (Benoit, Brazeal, & Airne, 2006) show little difference between the functions of Democrats and Republicans (Democrats acclaim in 62% of debate utterances, Republicans in 61%; Democrats attack in 30% of themes and Republicans in 28%). So we do not think we should read a great deal into the finding that Democrats are more negative than Republicans in primary debates.

On the other hand, the relationship between topic and political party is more consistent. At the presidential level, Democrats discuss policy more than Republicans in primary TV spots and debates and in general TV spots and debates (Benoit, in press; in Acceptances the difference is in this direction but does not reach the level of significance). On the other hand, general U.S. Senate debates do not show this relationship (Democrats discuss policy in 69% of utterances and Republicans in 70%; Benoit, Brazeal, & Airne, 2006). Benoit (2004) suggests that Democrats are more likely than Republicans to recommend governmental solutions to societal problems, which may lead them to discuss policy more in campaign messages. However, given the fact that this relationship was not found in general U.S. Senate debates, we must be cautious here.

All studies have some limitations and this one is no exception. In particular, the sample we were able to obtain is limited: one U.S. Senate, one U.S.

House, and two (Missouri) gubernatorial primary debates. This limitation is particularly acute for the analyses of the relationship between political party affiliation and campaign discourse. The Democratic data came exclusively from gubernatorial debates (and the same two candidates); the Republican data came from congress. So, we cannot rule out the possibility that the differences observed here are due to office (gubernatorial versus congress) rather than political party (Democrat versus Republican). Unfortunately, no other gubernatorial or congressional primary debate transcripts were available. Still, the patterns found here (except for political party differences) were consistent with patterns found in presidential primary and general debates. This study of non-presidential primary debates is a step forward, but we must keep in mind the limitation imposed by the nature of the sample of debates that were available for analysis.

Endnote

¹We express our appreciation to David Airne, University of Alabama, for sharing the congressional primary debate transcripts with us.

Appendix

Acclaims and Attacks on the Forms of Policy and Character

Policy

Past Deeds

Acclaim. Dean: "99 percent of all our kids under 18 have health insurance in my state, all our low-income working people, and a third of our seniors" (WI 2/15/04).

Attack. Dean: "George Bush is systematically looting the American treasury and giving it to his friends -- the pharmaceutical companies, the HMOs and the insurance companies" (WI 2/15/04).

Future Plans

Acclaim. Kucinich: "I'm the only one up here so far who's been willing to say that I'll cancel NAFTA and the WTO. That's specific action that will regain real power for the American workers and for workers everywhere" (WI 2/15/05).

Attack. Clark: "this 30th of June date" to turn over civilian authority in Iraq is a "politically motivated timetable" (SC 1/29/04).

General Goals

Acclaim. Kerry: "I think a president needs to put America back to work, and that's what I intend to do" (WI 2/15/04).

Attack. Dean: "In the State of the Union, the president promised another \$1 trillion tax cut. Where does he think he's going to get the money on top of the \$500 billion deficit?" (NH 1/22/04).

Character

Personal Qualities

Acclaim. Edwards: "I think it has to do with your own personal experience, what you've seen, what you'll get up every morning fighting for as presi-

dent of the United States... But I think it matters to have lived [a working class life], and I have lived it" (WI 2/15/04).

Attack. Kucinich: "The president lied to the American people" in his justification for war in Iraq (WI 2/15/04).

Leadership Ability

Acclaim. Lieberman: "I'm going to be a leader who will do what's right for America, whether it's politically popular or not. That's what a commander in chief should do" (MA 11/4/03).

Attack. Clark: "It's just about leadership. And that's what this president doesn't show in Washington on our economy" (SC 1/29/04).

Ideals

Acclaim. Lieberman: I'm "strong on civil rights... strong on values" (SC 1/29/04).

Attack. Dean: "But if we start giving up our fundamental liberties as Americans because terrorists attacked us, then we have a big problem. I honestly don't believe that John Ashcroft and George Bush... view the Constitution the way... most American citizens do" (SC 1/29/04).

All examples taken from 2004 Democratic presidential primary debates.

References

- Airne, D., & Benoit, W. L. (2005). 2004 Illinois U.S. Senate debates: Keyes versus Obama. *American Behavioral Scientist, 49*, 343-352.
- Banwart, M. C., & McKinney, M. S. (2005). A gendered influence in campaign debates? Analysis of mixed-gender United States senate and gubernatorial debates. *Communication Studies, 56*, 353-373.
- Benoit, P. J. (1997). *Telling the success story: Acclaiming and disclaiming discourse*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Benoit, W. L. (1999). *Seeing spots: A functional analysis of presidential television advertisements, 1952-1996*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Benoit, W. L. (2003). Presidential campaign discourse as a causal factor in election outcome. *Western Journal of Communication, 67*, 97-112.
- Benoit, W. L. (2004). Political party affiliation and presidential campaign discourse. *Communication Quarterly, 52*, 81-97.
- Benoit, W. L. (in press). *Communication in political campaigns*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Benoit, W. L., & Airne, D. (2005). A functional analysis of American vice presidential debates. *Argumentation and Advocacy, 41*, 225-236.
- Benoit, W. L., Blaney, J. R., & Pier, P. M. (1998). *Campaign '96: A functional analysis of acclaiming, attacking, and defending*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Benoit, W. L., & Brazeal, L. M. (2002). A functional analysis of the 1988 Bush-Dukakis presidential debates. *Argumentation and Advocacy, 38*, 219-233.
- Benoit, W. L., Brazeal, L. M., & Airne, D. (2006). *A functional analysis of U.S. Senate campaign debates*. Unpublished manuscript.

- Benoit, W. L., Hansen, G. J., & Verser, R. T. (2003). A meta-analysis of the effects of viewing presidential debates. *Communication Monographs, 70*, 335-350.
- Benoit, W. L., & Harthcock, A. (1999). Functions of the Great Debates: Acclaims, attacks, and defense in the 1960 presidential debates. *Communication Monographs, 66*, 341-357.
- Benoit, W. L., Pier, P. M., McHale, J. P., Hansen, G. J., & McGuire, J. P. (2003). *Campaign 2000: A functional analysis of acclaiming, attacking, and defending*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Benoit, W. L., Pier, P. M., Brazeal, L. M., McHale, J. P., Klyukovski, A., & Airne, D. (2002). *The primary decision: A functional analysis of debates in presidential primaries*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Benoit, W. L., & Wells, W. T. (1996). *Candidates in conflict: Persuasive attack and defense in the 1992 presidential debates*. Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press.
- Berelson, B. (1952). *Content analysis for the social sciences and humanities*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Bishop, G. F., Meadow, R. G., & Jackson-Beeck, M. (Eds.). (1978). *The presidential debates: Media, electoral, and policy perspectives*. New York: Praeger.
- Bitzer, L., & Rueter, T. (1980). *Carter vs Ford: The counterfeit debates of 1976*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Brazeal, L. M., & Benoit, W. L. (2001). A functional analysis of Congressional television spots, 1986-2000. *Communication Quarterly, 49*, 436-454.
- Bystrom, D. G., Roper, C., Gobetz, R., Massey, T., & Beal, C. (1991). The effects of a televised gubernatorial debate. *Political Communication Review, 16*, 57-80.
- Carlin, D. B., & McKinney, M. S. (1994). *The 1992 presidential debates in focus*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Cohen, J. (1960). A coefficient of agreement for nominal scales. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 20*, 37-46.
- Coleman, S. (2000). *Televised election debates: International perspectives*. London: Macmillan Press.
- Edelsky, C., & Adams, K. (1990). Creating inequality: Breaking the rules in debates. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 9*, 171-190.
- Friedenberg, R. V. (1994). *Rhetorical studies of national political debates—1960-1992* (2nd ed.). Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Friedenberg, R. V. (1997). *Rhetorical studies of national political debates—1996*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Hellweg, S. A., Pfau, M., & Brydon, S. R. (1992). *Televised presidential debates: Advocacy in contemporary America*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Hinck, E. A. (1993). *Enacting the presidency: Political argument, presidential debates, and presidential character*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Holsti, O. (1952). *Content analysis in communication research*. New York: Free Press.

The Small-College Communication Program: An Assessment of Communication Program Organization and Curricula at Private Liberal Arts Colleges in the Midwest and South

Brian R. McGee
Deborah Socha McGee

Abstract

The study investigates selected features of communication degree programs at small, private liberal arts colleges in the Midwest and South. Topics covered include how communication programs at such colleges are organized at the departmental level, what courses are most commonly offered in small-college communication programs, and what course enrollment limits are typical for such programs. Our findings suggest that communication programs are now commonly found at such institutions, with most housed in academic units that refer to communication in the unit name. Beyond relatively widespread commitments to restricting course enrollments, these programs are generally marked by great diversity in their course offerings and apparent foci.

Introduction

Whether measured by the number of communication programs at U.S. universities or the number of graduates produced by such programs, the communication disciplines have grown rapidly since the mid-twentieth century. The story of this growth has been told in many places, and we will not repeat it here. At its core, this story begins with the emergence of communication as a distinct discipline (or set of related disciplines) separate from English, sociology, and psychology. During the twentieth century these communication disciplines would form their own regional, national, and international organizations and were marked by the creation of undergraduate and graduate programs at public and private universities throughout the United States and, eventually, around the world.

The stories told about the growth of the communication disciplines historically have emphasized large research universities and their graduate programs. Smaller, undergraduate-centered colleges and universities have received much less attention in these narratives, with rare exceptions (e.g., Hamilton College). More has been written about the programs of larger, usually public, universities, ranging from early innovations at Cornell University and the University of Wisconsin (Gray, 1954) to relatively recent curricular and organizational concerns at Ohio University (Nelson, 1995b) and Wichita State University (Keel, 1995). Finally, studies of disciplinary trends may include small, private liberal arts colleges in their analysis of those trends (e.g., King, 1998), but such studies may

Speaker and Gavel, Vol 43 (2006)

www.dsr-tka.org/

Speaker and Gavel, Vol 43 (2006)

www.dsr-tka.org/

mask features of small-college communication programs that are unique to such programs.

Because we agree with Nelson's (1995a, p. 133) claim that "the communication disciplines are all over the country in every size and type of higher education" institution, we wish to examine the small, private institutions that historically have been inadequately considered in attempts to assess the discipline. In this study we concentrate on private liberal arts colleges in the Midwest and South to consider how these colleges offer communication programs to their students. We do so by investigating how communication programs are organized at the departmental level, what courses are most commonly offered in small-college communication programs, and what enrollment limits are typical for such programs.

Literature Review

Ranging from a few hundred to a few thousand students, small, private liberal arts colleges are roughly 750 of the 3,500 colleges and universities in the United States (Bonvillian & Murphy, 1996). While some of these institutions are supported by significant endowments, most have relatively small endowments and are tuition-dependent. With no public support for their operating budgets, many small liberal arts colleges face disastrous fiscal consequences if their enrollments decline even slightly. Cumulatively, these institutions have an enormous impact on higher education in the U.S., but their relative obscurity outside their immediate regions led Astin and Lee (1972) to label them "invisible colleges." With over 500 member institutions in the U.S., the Council of Independent Colleges (CIC) is a consortium of these small colleges that provides resource and advocacy services for its members. (While CIC institutions are not necessarily liberal arts colleges, the typical CIC institution probably would describe itself as such.)

For a few small colleges, departments of "speech," "oratory," or "public speaking" emerged in the nineteenth century, with such institutions as DePauw University, Hamilton College, Wabash College, and Whitman College mentioned in Smith's (1954) famous account of the development of discipline-centered departments. However, like other larger colleges and universities, many small colleges began to add communication programs only during the mid and late twentieth century as these programs became increasingly popular with students. In some cases, communication programs were not added without considerable resistance from the tight-knit faculties common to such institutions (Hotchkiss, 2002), who perceived communication programs as providing vocational education outside the liberal arts core. Even where enthusiastic support for communication programs has long existed, however, the small size and scale of these institutions often limit them to hiring only a very few full-time faculty to support the program. The challenges of staffing small-college communication programs have long been recognized (e.g., Corrigan, 1957).

In this study, we hope to provide a snapshot of these small-college communication programs as they are experienced by students at such institutions. We do so by looking at small liberal arts colleges in the Midwest and South. These

adjoining regions were chosen to reduce the likelihood of regional differences emerging as a confounding variable in this study and to minimize the risk of regional overrepresentation in random sampling, given the very large number of liberal arts colleges found in New England and the mid-Atlantic states.

Method

Beginning with the list of over 500 colleges and universities listed as member institutions on the Web site of the Council of Independent Colleges (CIC), a population of 96 institutions was identified for 19 contiguous Midwestern and Southern states. Forty-six colleges and universities were then randomly selected as the sample to be assessed. Beginning in late 2002, undergraduate students were recruited to retrieve information about communication programs from the Web sites of these 46 institutions. The students were trained to collect material for any major and/or program that seemed logically related to a communication discipline (e.g., speech communication, broadcasting, journalism). Courses and/or programs in communication disorders (i.e., speech pathology and audiology) were excluded from this analysis, as were courses and/or programs in theatre. Web sites that were incomplete or did not function when first visited were visited at a later date to see if data retrieval was possible. If it was not, the institution was not analyzed for the study.

Following the retrieval of information from 44 of the 46 institutions, a graduate student was trained by the first author to compile data collected regarding the organization of communication programs and the courses most commonly offered by small-college communication programs. First, the name of the department or other academic unit housing the communication program or major was identified. Second, the student coded courses, including courses with alternate names, for consistency with courses at other institutions (e.g., "Presentational Strategies" at one university was coded as a "Public Speaking" course for the purposes of this study). Course data for 20% of the institutions were randomly selected and then independently coded by the second author, who was trained by the first author and had no prior involvement in the study at that time. Intercoder reliability, assessed using percentage of agreement, was .90.

Following the collection of the data described in the previous paragraphs, representatives from 40 institutions listed as CIC members and having identifiable communication programs and faculty or departmental e-mail addresses were then randomly selected and contacted via e-mail and asked to supply maximum course enrollments for their institutions for four common communication courses. Four of these e-mail messages were returned as undeliverable. Seventeen of the 36 schools (47%) contacted provided course enrollment limitation data for some or all of the courses mentioned in the initial e-mail.

Findings

To supply a picture of the communication programs at small liberal arts colleges in the Midwest and South, we looked for data in three areas. First, we sought to identify the department, school, or other academic unit most immediately responsible for offering communication courses. Second, we wanted to

discover the courses most commonly offered at these institutions. Third, we hoped to uncover the typical class sizes at such institutions.

For the 44 institutions for which we retrieved usable information, 39 clearly had undergraduate programs offering one of the majors we would today associate with the speech communication and/or mass communication traditions (e.g., communication, journalism). The remaining five institutions did not have a communication major or did not clearly identify this major on their Web sites. Again, communication disorders programs and majors were excluded from our analysis.

Program Organization

Most recently, King (1998) relied on data from 176 institutions to report on the department names used by departments listed in the National Communication Association (NCA) Directory. For the institutions in our sample, we specifically worked to identify the name of the academic department or other unit most immediately responsible for offering communication courses. In doing so we assumed that a department chair, school director, or school or college dean would have formal responsibility for leadership of the unit. For example, if a college or university had a communication program located in its Department of Humanities, we identified the Department of Humanities as the immediately responsible unit.

The unit names are listed in order of frequency in Table 1. Consistent with King's findings for all NCA-listed institutions, "Department of Communication" is the most common unit name for these liberal arts colleges with communication programs, and 22 of 38 communication programs (58%) identified here had "communication" incorporated in the titles of their academic units. Several communication programs (16%) were housed with other humanities disciplines in a "Department of Humanities." When not housed individually or in humanities departments, communication most commonly shared a departmental home with theatre or fine arts (however defined).

For this sample, no department or other immediately responsible academic unit used "journalism" or "mass communication" in the unit name. However, we asked a student coder to generate independently a list of 50 communication programs and the departments responsible for those programs from a list of randomly selected CIC institutions located throughout the United States. Two of those 50 institutions had departments using these terms in their names, a "Department of Mass Communication" and a "Department of Communication and Journalism."

Table 1
List of Academic Unit Titles in Order of Frequency

Name	Number of Institutions
Department of Communication	8
Department of Humanities	7
Department of Communication Arts	5
Department of Communication and Theatre Arts	2
Department of Speech Communication and Theatre	2
School of Communication	1
School of Communication and Arts	1
Department of Communication and Fine Arts	1
Department of English, Theatre, and Speech Communication	1
Department of Communication and Theatre	1
Department of Cultural and Interdisciplinary Studies	1
Fine Arts Area/College of Liberal Arts	1
Unclear	4*
Unknown	8**

* A communication program of some sort clearly existed, but the academic unit responsible for the program was not readily identified from the available online materials.

** It was not evident that a communication major or program existed at this institution, or no information regarding the responsible academic units was available online.

Curriculum

We identified 48 courses or course types offered at the 39 colleges with identifiable communication programs; sixteen of these courses or course types appeared at half or more of the colleges and universities included in the sample. In some cases courses (including course titles) were very similar across those institutions offering them; in other cases, course titles and descriptions varied considerably. A list of these courses in order of frequency appears in Table 2, with courses listed only once excluded from this list or folded into one of several "miscellaneous" categories. Courses we would describe as products of both the speech communication tradition and the journalism and mass communication tradition were included on multiple occasions among the top 16 courses or course types.

Table 2
Communication Courses in Order of Frequency

Course Name**	Number of Institutions
Organizational Communication	32
Miscellaneous Mass/Mediated Communication	30***
Internship	31
Interpersonal Communication	31
Public Speaking	30

Capstone/Senior Seminar	27
Small Group Communication	26
Miscellaneous Media Production	26***
Public Relations	25
Miscellaneous Required Theatre Courses	24***
Persuasion	23
Writing for the Media	23
Intercultural Communication	22
Miscellaneous Communication/Speech Communication	22***
Communication Theory (200 level and above)	20#
Argumentation and Debate	20
Research Methods	18
Miscellaneous Journalism	18***
Principles of Mass Media	17
Oral Interpretation/Performance Studies	17
Miscellaneous Rhetoric	11***
Introduction to Communication (100 level)	14#
Communication/Mass Media Law	14
Voice and Diction	12
Business and Professional Communication	11
Mass Media and Society	10
Interviewing	9
Forensics	9
Gender and Communication	7
Advanced Public Speaking	7
Leadership	6
Desktop Publishing	6
Advertising	5
Conflict Management	5
Political Communication	5
Family Communication	5
Listening	4
Nonverbal Communication	4
Advanced Organizational Communication	3
Advanced Interpersonal Communication	2
Communication Ethics	2
Miscellaneous Religious Communication	2***

* Special-topics courses and independent-study courses were excluded from this analysis. Such courses were nearly universal in our sample. Presumably such courses allow for more variety in course offerings for departments with small faculties.
 ** While initially incorporated in the coding scheme, some courses only appeared once and are excluded from this table (e.g., health communication, parliamentary procedure.)
 *** A course in the “miscellaneous” category did not readily match up with other courses in the sample.
 # Coders were instructed to distinguish between introductory survey courses with significant performance requirements and 200-level courses and above that more obviously had the discussion of communication theory as their foci.

Course Enrollment Limits

For this portion of the study, communication-program representatives of 40 CIC institutions were contacted and asked to provide the maximum number of students permitted to enroll in the four most common communication courses identified in Table 2: Organizational Communication, Interpersonal Communication, Public Speaking, and Small Group Communication. Four of these 40 messages were returned as undeliverable. For the 17 responses we received, the data are reported in Table 3.

Table 3
 Maximum Enrollments for Common Communication Courses

<i>Course Median</i>	<i>No. of Responses</i>	<i>Mean</i>
Organizational Communication	15*	23.3
24		
Interpersonal Communication	16	21.7
21		
Public Speaking	15	21.7
21		
Small Group	13	23.4
24		

*For this course, one institution indicated that no enrollment maximum was specified by the institution. We excluded this response from the analysis reported here.

Discussion

Based on our findings concerning small, private liberal arts colleges in the Midwest and South, we offer several observations regarding the communication programs at these institutions, based on the three dimensions considered in this study.

First, communication programs are found in some fashion at the great majority (86%) of the 44 institutions for which usable data were retrieved. Our data do not speak to the size of these programs relative to other programs at these institutions, but communication programs appear to be a normal or typical feature of the degree offerings at such colleges. While many of these programs are housed in omnibus humanities units that offer many other degree programs, most are housed in academic units that in some way use the term “communication” in the unit title.

Second, the communication programs at these liberal arts colleges were quite diverse, and our data suggest no universal agreement on what courses are required to offer a communication program. When independent study courses, special topics courses, internship courses, capstone courses, and the miscellane-

ous course categories are excluded, only five specifically identifiable courses—Organizational Communication, Interpersonal Communication, Public Speaking, Small Group Communication, and Public Relations—are taught at 64% or more of the institutions in this sample. Such a lack of consensus about a common core inventory of courses may contribute to institutional and student confusion about the identity and core mission of communication programs, assuming that such a common identity does or should exist. The prominence of courses in interpersonal, organizational, and mediated communication does suggest the rhetorical tradition—often associated with the liberal arts tradition of communication pedagogy, dating to the nineteenth century—does not dominate these communication programs at liberal arts colleges. Instead, the entire range of communication scholarship and instructional practice is represented in these programs, albeit with considerable variation from institution to institution.

Third, these programs do not respect old distinctions between the speech communication and journalism and mass communication research traditions. Courses in Public Relations, Media Writing, Media Production, and Principles of Mass Media were commonly offered at these institutions, as were courses in Organizational Communication, Interpersonal Communication, Persuasion, and Argumentation and Debate. While communication studies departments and journalism schools often exist separately from one another at larger institutions, these communication programs at liberal arts colleges embrace the entirety of the communication disciplines.

Fourth, the course catalogs at these institutions suggest a strong commitment to both for-credit internship opportunities and senior seminar or capstone experiences. These data cannot speak to the actual extent of internship opportunities or the commitment to offering the capstone course with regularity, but they do suggest some recognition of the importance of such opportunities to student learning and/or institutional assessment.

Fifth, and not surprisingly for institutions that make small size a virtue in their promotional materials and self-descriptions (Bonvillian & Murphy, 1996), these institutions generally cap course enrollments at very modest maximums. For example, only one of the 17 responses for Public Speaking indicated a course enrollment maximum of over 24 students. However, these data do not allow for comparison to enrollment caps in other disciplines at small liberal arts colleges or to enrollment caps in communication courses at other, larger institutions.

Limitations and Conclusions

Several limitations of this study mean that the data reported here should be interpreted with great caution, with these limitations also suggesting fruitful possibilities for further research. First, there are limits to the conclusions that can be drawn based on data drawn from institutional Web sites. Such data are often incomplete or out of date. Small colleges in many cases have very limited technological resources and, as a result, may have inadequate or unreliable Internet materials. Additionally, Web sites typically do not indicate how frequently a course might be taught. A course listed on a site may be taught regu-

larly, or it may not have been taught for several years. Inactive courses are removed from course lists more quickly at some institutions than at others.

Second, our findings provide a snapshot of the communication programs at these institutions. Such research does not capture general trends or the evolution of these programs over time, yet such data are required for a more complete picture of communication pedagogy at small, private liberal arts colleges. Smith's (1954) summary of the development of speech departments through the mid twentieth century indicates that these departments often changed dramatically from year to year, and the unsystematic impression we gathered from reviewing some Web sites was that some institutions in our sample had made significant and recent changes in their communication programs.

Third, we did not collect data on the courses required by these communication programs of all undergraduate communication majors. To the extent that the required core of communication courses signals faculty beliefs about disciplinary identity and desirable outcomes for students, a review of these core courses should provide helpful information.

Fourth, our definition of the population to be sampled requires should be carefully examined by those who might use this study as a starting point for advocacy. While our intent is to minimize problems with regional variation and sampling, generalizing our results beyond the Midwest and South could be problematic. Also, we confined our efforts to CIC member institutions, but a great many small and/or liberal arts colleges are not CIC members, and some relatively small liberal arts colleges are publicly supported. The bias to CIC members creates another problem for generalizing our results.

Fifth, this discussion is marked by our inability to collect adequate data on the number of communication faculty at the institutions in our sample, a dimension on which we originally intended to report. The variation in faculty-rank designations at these institutions, when combined with incomplete and/or outdated Web sites, made reasonably accurate reports impossible to generate. Self-report data on full-time faculty support for these programs will be required in future research to create a satisfactory account of staffing levels. Notwithstanding the emphasis many liberal arts colleges place on the use of full-time faculty in the classroom, our fragmentary and confusing data do suggest that many of these colleges rely on part-time, adjunct instructors to support 20% or more of their communication courses. We also were not able to collect data on the number of communication majors at these institutions, as such data were not available on institutional Web sites or were summarized in the most general terms (e.g., "approximately 100 communication majors").

In closing, small, private liberal arts colleges frequently have been "invisible" contributors to the communication disciplines, yet these institutions produce thousands of communication graduates and are major stakeholders in the disciplinary debates over matters of self-definition, communication administration, instructional pragmatics, and so on. We are well advised in the communication disciplines to learn more about the state of these communication programs in order to provide better advice to those considering faculty careers in

such institutions and to consider best practices emerging at these flexible and dynamic colleges and universities.

References

- Astin, A., & Lee, C. (1972). *The invisible colleges*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Corrigan, R. W. (1957). Can the small liberal arts colleges secure a qualified speech staff? *Central States Speech Journal*, 8, 38-42.
- Bonvillian, G., & Murphy, R. (1996). *The liberal arts college adapting to change: The survival of small schools*. New York: Garland.
- Gray, G. W. (1954). Some teachers and the transition to twentieth-century speech education. In K. R. Wallace (Ed.), *History of Speech Education in America* (pp. 422-446). New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Hotchkiss, E. (2002). Transforming the small college: A challenge for presidential leadership. In R. M. Diamond (Ed.), *Field Guide to Academic Leadership* (pp. 401-412). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Keel, V. (1995). Elliott School of Communication, Wichita State University. *Journal of the Association for Communication Administration*, 3, 148-152.
- King, C. P. (1998). A national survey of core course requirements, department names, and undergraduate program titles in communication. *Journal of the Association for Communication Administration*, 7, 154-162.
- Nelson, P. E. (1995a). What is happening to the communication disciplines? *Journal of the Association for Communication Administration*, 3, 132-135.
- Nelson, P. E. (1995b). Ohio University's College of Communication. *Journal of the Association for Communication Administration*, 3, 141-147.
- Smith, D. K. (1954). Origin and development of departments of speech. In K. R. Wallace (Ed.), *History of Speech Education in America* (pp. 447-470). New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Brian R. McGee, Ph.D., is an associate professor and chair at College of Charleston, South Carolina.
Deborah Socha McGee is an adjunct associate professor at College of Charleston, South Carolina.

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/

(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)

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

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 35th Annual Age of Aquarius Forensics Invitational at Ball State University, 20 coaches and 60 students attending the 57th annual L. E. Norton Forensics Invitational at Bradley University, and 20 coaches and 60 students attending the 3rd 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/

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) www.dsr-tka.org/

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
Norm	9	6
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
Norm	4	3
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.

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
Norm	32	15
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
Norm	32	15
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
Rule	20	8
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 13
Prompt 3

	Students	Coaches
Rule	20	6
Norm	9	11
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
Norm	15	12
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
Norm	17	13
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

Table 19
Prompt 9

	Students	Coaches
Rule	7	2
Norm	10	6
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
Rule	34	8
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
Norm	29	15
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
Rule	18	13
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
Norm	12	10
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
Norm	31	17
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
Norm	22	12
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
Rule	32	19
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 (i.e., 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 35th Annual Age of Aquarius Forensics Invitational at Ball State University, the 57th annual L. E. Norton Forensics Invitational at Bradley University, or the 3rd 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

Speaker and Gavel, Vol 43 (2006)

www.dsr-tka.org/

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.

Speaker and Gavel, Vol 43 (2006)

www.dsr-tka.org/

Speaker & Gavel 2006	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 & Gavel 2006	82
A competitor's persuasive speech is ending at 10:07 in competition.	Rules Norms Ethics No Violation
Questionnaire (for students)	
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

<i>Speaker & Gavel 2006</i>					83
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.					
A persuasive is done on a question of value, not policy.	Rules	Norms	Ethics	No Violation	
A competitor's persuasive speech is ending at 10:07 in competition.	Rules	Norms	Ethics	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.

84	<i>Speaker & Gavel 2006</i>
	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 http://www.phirhopi.org/prp/spkrpts4.2/rice.html
	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 http://www.phirhopi.org/prp/spkrpts5.2/gaskill.htm
	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 & 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 th 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 77th 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.